

John P. Lucas.
 Roscoe C. Batson.
 Alvan C. Sandeford.
 Ira T. Wyche.
 Lewis H. Brereton.
 Edward A. Millar, jr.
 Clyde J. McConkey.
 Albert M. Jones.
 Robert S. Oberly.
 Leon R. Cole.
 Paul L. Ferron.
 George E. Arnemann.
 Clarence D. Lang.
 Isaac Spalding.
 Harry J. Malony.
 Robert F. Hyatt.
 Archibald V. Arnold.
 Earl B. Hochwalt.
 Francis T. Armstrong.
 Hamilton Templeton.
 William R. Gruber.
 William A. Copthorne.
 Eugene T. Spencer.
 Falkner Heard.

COAST ARTILLERY CORPS.

To be major.

John B. Christian.

To be captains.

Sebring C. Megill.
 Henry H. Pfeil.
 Walter W. Merrill.
 Frank Moorman.

INFANTRY ARM.

To be first lieutenants.

Theodore R. Murphy.
 Philip Coldwell.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

Lieut. Col. Thomas U. Raymond to be colonel.
 Maj. Clarence J. Manly to be lieutenant colonel.
 Capt. Henry C. Pillsbury to be major.

PROMOTIONS AND APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY.

Lieut. Francis J. Cleary to be a lieutenant commander.
 Lieut. Herbert H. Michael to be a lieutenant commander.
 The following named citizens to be assistant surgeons in the Medical Reserve Corps.
 William J. C. Agnew.
 Alanson L. Bryan.

POSTMASTERS.

CALIFORNIA.

Frederick Donaghy, Universal City.
 Frank J. Kolash, Norwalk.

DELAWARE.

Grover C. Gregg, Yorklyn.

ILLINOIS.

Polona H. Callaway, Tallula.
 J. D. Downer, Downers Grove.
 Ardelia M. Field, Dieterich.
 Anthony R. Gorman, Raymond.
 John D. Harpole, Nebo.
 P. H. Langan, Odell.
 Phillip Maher, Elmwood.
 William F. Peterson, Brownstown.
 Charles P. Regan, Capron.
 Drew Tufts, Centralia.
 Traverse R. Wright, Seaton.

KANSAS.

William Barrett, Pratt.

KENTUCKY.

W. T. Dudgeon, Walton.
 Richard F. Neely, Franklin.

MARYLAND.

Charles A. Barnes, Silver Spring.
 Katherine E. Brice, Betterton.
 Ella V. Cronin, Perryman.

MICHIGAN.

Verd H. Carpenter, Central Lake.

MINNESOTA.

Anna E. Baker, Brownston.
 Henry Hendrickson, Hoffman.
 Bessie H. Johnson, Echo.
 N. Elmie Lewis, Bertha.
 Wallace O. Merrill, Silver Lake.
 Daniel J. Sullivan, Ellendale.

MISSOURI.

Aubra M. Green, Armstrong.
 Clifford E. Miller, Verona.
 Clyde A. Perkins, Barnard.
 Goldie Wilson, Parnell.

NEBRASKA.

Hertha L. Mershon, Wilcox.

NEW JERSEY.

George M. Keebler, Glassboro.

NEW YORK.

Raymond J. Carden, Mountain Dale.
 Michael Culligan, Wurtsboro.
 Francis O. Driscoll, Staten Island (late Tompkinsville).
 Oscar M. Grubb, Kennedy.
 Thomas M. Keegan, Ferndale.
 Patrick H. Townsend, Essex.
 George E. Wroten, Trudeau.

NORTH CAROLINA.

William S. Carawan, Columbia.
 Charlie G. Foushee, Ramseur.
 J. N. Fuquay, Lillington.
 William Z. Gibson, Gibson.
 Margaret W. Mann, Swanquarter.
 Otho G. Turbyfill, Huntersville.

OHIO.

Charles J. Quelette, Shepard.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Frank Clancy, Conneautville.
 Joseph L. Infield, Fredonia.
 Katharyn McClellan, Marienville.
 Edward F. Poist, McSherrytown.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

William McFarland, Dell Rapids.
 Mary A. Pike, Tyndall.

TEXAS.

Carrie M. Brooks, McCaulley.
 Frank Farrington, Diboll.
 A. W. Melton, Bellevue.

VIRGINIA.

Benjamin W. Council, Holland.
 George E. Honts, Eagle Rock.
 John L. T. Speed, Gordonsville.
 John A. Whitelaw, Monterey.

WASHINGTON.

Oscar W. Behrmann, Fairfield.
 Richard Nagle, Marcus.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, January 8, 1917.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Imbue us plenteously, O Lord God of Hosts, with heavenly gifts, that we may control our thoughts, direct our ways, and possess our souls in patience through the deliberations of this, another congressional day, and accord to others here and elsewhere the same rights we desire for ourselves with perfect urbanity; that the genius of our Republic may be fulfilled, and peace and happiness may obtain throughout our borders, now and forevermore. In the spirit of the Master, amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, January 6, 1917, was read and approved.

JOINT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE RAILROAD LEGISLATION.

Mr. ADAMSON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. ADAMSON. I desire to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 190, reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, entitled "Joint resolution to continue and extend the time for making report of the joint subcommittee appointed under a joint

resolution entitled 'Joint resolution creating a joint subcommittee from the membership of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate the conditions relating to interstate and foreign commerce and the necessity of further legislation relating thereto, and defining the powers and duties of such subcommittee,' approved July 20, 1916, and providing for the filling of vacancies in said subcommittee."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 190. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what the resolution provides.

Mr. RAYBURN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bill of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster at St. Paul, Minn., with a special canceling die for the winter sports carnival of that city; and

S. 7556. An act to grant to the Mahoning & Shenango Railway & Light Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, complete, maintain, and operate a combination dam and bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the borough of Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, joint resolution of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. J. Res. 191. Joint resolution authorizing the Postmaster General to provide the postmaster at St. Paul, Minn., with a special canceling die for the winter sports carnival of that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

An act (S. 7556) to grant to the Mahoning & Shenango Railway & Light Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, complete, maintain, and operate a combination dam and bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, near the borough of Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. SHERWOOD rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise?

Mr. SHERWOOD. To ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record an editorial from the Ohio State Journal 3 inches in length and an eight-line editorial from the State Journal, of Topeka, Kans.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to insert in the Record a couple of editorials, one from a Topeka (Kans.) paper and the other from a Columbus (Ohio) paper. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the editorials referred to:

[Editorial from Ohio State Journal, Jan. 1, 1917.]

ON ANOTHER'S BEAT.

In reference to the testimony of Gen. Scott, Chief of Staff, before the Senate committee, in which he said this country needed 3,000,000 trained men to be ready for future wars, the thoughtful and dignified New Republic said of the general: "He may be a good soldier, but he should be forbidden in the future to disclose in public the mischievous folly of his political opinions." And, further, that paper adds, "Let us thank God we are still governed by civilians." The same remark might refer to Gen. Wood, who makes every effort possible to appear as a statesman when his business is entirely foreign to that. As soon as a general goes to dabbling in politics he should be court-martialed. It is hard for some people to discriminate on matters of this kind, but the difference is as wide as a river. A general deals with army formation and drill, and not with legislation and policies, and he should be taught the distinction at West Point.

[From the Topeka (Kans.) State Journal.]

NOT THE MILITIA.

One might almost suppose Gens. Wood and Scott, who testify so glibly to the failure of the militia, never heard that it was the Thirtieth Regular Cavalry that Villa caught asleep at Columbus, N. Mex. Neither was it militia officers that led the troopers of the Tenth Cavalry into the ambush at Carrizal.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CONRY] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, with Mr. CONRY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill for amendment.

Salaries, Bureau of Markets: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 administrative assistant, \$2,500; 1 administrative assistant, \$1,980; 5 clerks, class 4; 10 clerks, class 3; 15 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,380; 1 clerk, \$1,320; 29 clerks, class 1; 1 clerk, \$1,140; 2 clerks, at \$1,100 each; 30 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 3 clerks, at \$1,080 each; 2 clerks, at \$1,020 each; 20 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 clerks, at \$840 each; 2 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,800; 1 mechanical assistant, \$1,380; 1 laboratory helper, \$900; 3 laboratory aids, at \$900 each; 1 laboratory aid, \$840; 7 laboratory aids, at \$720 each; 2 laboratory aids, at \$600 each; 1 photographer, \$1,400; 1 photographer, \$1,200; one supervising telegrapher, \$1,620; 1 telegraph operator, \$1,400; 2 telegraph operators, at \$1,200 each; 1 telephone operator, \$600; 1 draftsman, \$900; 1 map tracer, \$900; 1 map tracer, \$720; 1 map tracer, \$600; 1 map tracer, \$480; 2 skilled laborers, at \$900 each; 1 laborer, \$720; 2 laborers, at \$660 each; 4 messenger boys or laborers, at \$600 each; 4 messenger boys or laborers, at \$540 each; 10 messenger boys or laborers, at \$480 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$420 each; 1 messenger boy, \$360; 1 charwoman, \$540; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 1 charwoman, \$300; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$198,320.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 64, lines 10 to 13, for the purpose of offering the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk, for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to page 64, line 10, for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, let us see what it is.

Mr. STAFFORD. I send it to the Clerk's desk to be read for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend. on page 64, at the end of line 13, by inserting the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the leasing of modern fireproof buildings for the use of the Department of Agriculture for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the Government for a period not to exceed five years at annual rentals not to exceed the amount herein appropriated and at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 34 cents."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to return to page 64 for the purpose of offering the amendment as read by the Clerk. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, let me suggest to the gentleman from Wisconsin that items of that character are usually carried in what are called "miscellaneous" items, a little further on in the bill, and I do not think it is necessary to return to page 64.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say to the gentleman that in the legislative, executive, and judicial bill we carry legislation of this character following the item providing for rent, and I think it is proper to insert it right here, because it refers to the amount that is carried in this item, that "he is authorized to enter into contracts to an amount not to exceed the amount herein appropriated." I think it is more appropriate to insert it here than in the item referred to by the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Where is it appropriate to insert it?

Mr. STAFFORD. On page 64, lines 10 to 13.

Mr. LEVER. Would not my colleague be willing to defer that until my colleague from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] looks into it? He is familiar with the details.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am willing to do that. I will withdraw it for the time being, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin temporarily withdraws his amendment. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting and distributing, by telegraph, mail, and otherwise, timely information on the supply, commercial movement, disposition, and market prices of fruits and vegetables, \$184,740, of which sum \$40,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. Particularly as to that clause which makes the amount of \$40,000 immediately available. Last year we made an appropriation for the work of this bureau of \$136,000, and I rise to ask about the necessity of an additional \$40,000 to be made immediately available.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman understands that under this item the department is undertaking to furnish information to producers and consumers with respect to the volume of certain perishable products, vegetables, potatoes, and the like. It has come to our attention that the amount recommended last year was not entirely sufficient to enable them to open their work early this spring in time to take care of the movement of some crops, like strawberries and the earlier maturing vegetables, and they thought that to make this amount immediately available would very materially increase the value of that service. It is for that reason that we allowed it.

Mr. COLLIER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLIER. I want to say that the work done on this line has been attended with the most marked success and is very gratifying.

Mr. LEVER. The information before the committee is that the work under this item has more than justified the hopes of the committee and the hopes of the department itself; and if we can go along conservatively and wisely, without asking the department to do too much, we ought to establish a very splendid piece of machinery for the marketing of these very perishable products.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I hardly understand the mathematics of the committee in this and other items, where they make available a large portion of the appropriation for the remainder of the present fiscal year. There has been appropriated for this item \$136,000 for the present fiscal year, and you intend to increase that by this \$40,000 item, making it \$176,000. Subtract the \$40,000 from the total of \$184,000 appropriated in this item, and it will make only \$144,000 available for the next fiscal year. So there will be \$176,000 available for expenditure this fiscal year and only \$144,000 available for expenditure in the next fiscal year.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true. What we are trying to do here, in effect, is practically to change the beginning of the year on this particular item, and we have got to make up for the gap somewhere. Does the gentleman catch my point? For example, we have found that in the appropriation of the amount carried in the current law we have not enough money available for taking advantage of the movement of these perishables early in the spring. Therefore it is in a degree a deficiency; but if we appropriate \$40,000 and make it immediately available, that will carry us next year to the same point, and we shall begin there and will not need any deficiency appropriation for the next year. We are trying to get this appropriation so that it will cover the entire year. As it is now, there is a gap somewhere that we are trying to fill up.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is certainly novel and may be explicable to the wonderful intellect of the gentleman from South Carolina, but it is rather dark and vague and hidden to me.

Mr. LEVER. Perhaps I have not made myself entirely clear.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as there is another committee that has jurisdiction over deficiency appropriations, I feel constrained to make the point of order to the language in lines 6 and 7—

Of which sum \$40,000 shall be immediately available.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to gather from stockmen, live-stock associations, State live-stock and agricultural boards, common carriers, stockyards, commission firms, live-stock exchanges, slaughtering and meat-packing companies, and others information relative to the number of different classes and grades of marketable live stock, especially cattle, hogs, and sheep in the principal live-stock feeding districts and growing sections; prices, receipts, and shipments of the different classes and grades of cattle, hogs, and sheep at live-stock market centers; prices of meats and meat food products and the amounts of such products in storage; to compile and publish such information at such frequent intervals as most effectively to guide producers, consumers, and distributors in the sale and purchase of live stock, meats, and other animal products; and to gather and publish any related information pertaining to marketing and distribution of live stock, meats, and animal by-products, the sum of \$66,800.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MANN: Amend, on page 75, after line 25, by inserting as a new paragraph the following:

"To make investigation relating to the production, transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of agri-

cultural food products, including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products, or any of them, by any individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations, \$50,000."

Mr. LEVER. I reserve a point of order on that. Does the gentleman from Illinois offer it as a new paragraph?

Mr. MANN. As a new paragraph.

Mr. LEVER. I should like to hear the gentleman's statement on that, please.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think there is a general desire that there shall be an investigation along these lines. I think the Bureau of Markets of the Agricultural Department is qualified to make it more economically and more efficiently than any other bureau or branch of the Government service. It is right in line with the work that that bureau is doing.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the gentleman's idea that this investigational work as to the monopolizing of the market by cornering foodstuffs can be better undertaken by the Department of Agriculture than by the Department of Justice? I suppose we are all in sympathy with the main purpose of the gentleman's amendment, and perhaps if we can not get the fullest results from the Department of Justice there can be no objection to investing authority in the Department of Agriculture, if any good can result from the investigation of the hold-up of commodities.

Mr. MANN. Of course the Bureau of Markets is best qualified to make the examination and investigation. If it should obtain information which ought to be turned over to the Department of Justice, I take it that would be done.

Mr. DOWELL. I desire to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if with this further investigation it will be necessary to increase this appropriation?

Mr. MANN. I have provided for an appropriation of \$50,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has been a long time coming, but is it not a fact that the Department of Justice has begun an investigation into the high cost of living?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. I suppose they are continually making some investigations in the Department of Justice, but the Bureau of Markets are dealing with these questions all the time, and can more easily obtain the information than anyone else.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, there is so much confusion around me that I can not hear a word of what gentlemen are saying, and this is a very important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This is a very important matter. If I am not mistaken, the district attorney at Boston has been assigned by the Attorney General to make an inquiry as to the reason for the high cost of living, and he has submitted a report—perhaps a partial report—indicating that delays in shipment are very largely accountable for the increase in the cost of living, and that the holding up of cars in particular has much to do with the increase in the price of coal and much to do also with the increase in the price of foodstuffs that are held in cars.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that that is the case.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman's idea is that there should be an independent inquiry in the Department of Agriculture through the Bureau of Markets, which may lead to information that may be transmitted to the Attorney General if it is found to come within the purview of that department?

Mr. MANN. Well, if there is manipulation, yes; but the Bureau of Markets is qualified to make an investigation along the lines that it is now pursuing, not only to ascertain whether there should be a criminal prosecution but also to ascertain how to remove the evils that now exist that add very much to the cost of living.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's purpose, except that it occurs to me that if another investigation is to be had without any compelling power, in the event of anything being discovered as to the cause of the high cost of living, we would be duplicating work and getting nowhere.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow a suggestion?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to make the suggestion that the investigation being made by the Department of Justice is limited in two regards: First, to an investigation as to whether or not the law already in existence has been violated, and, second, the question as to whether the law has been violated in a particular place under the jurisdiction of some particular district attorney in some city. The investigations that are made by the Department of Agriculture will be general in their nature, and it will recommend, if necessary, whether or not new law may not be

required or amendments to the existing law. An investigation will not be limited to a particular locality, but extended to all principal markets in the United States. In my judgment it is very important that the Department of Agriculture should make the investigation.

Mr. LEVER. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Illinois if he regards this proposition as likely to be a continuing appropriation—that is, for more than one or two years?

Mr. MANN. I do not know how long it would take.

Mr. LEVER. It would take 12 months at least, or 2 years, because the gentleman's proposition involves a broad inquiry into the economics of the situation.

Mr. MANN. In bringing the production to the consumption in the most economical manner.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, there has been a great deal of complaint about the shortage of car service. Does the gentleman from Illinois construe his amendment to hold that the department shall go into an investigation of that subject and ascertain the cause and recommend a remedy for the shortage of car service?

Mr. MANN. Probably not; but still they might make suggestions as to the shortage of car service in certain matters. Of course, the Interstate Commerce Commission has jurisdiction with reference to the shortage of car service. The Bureau of Markets now makes recommendation in order to supply the market at particular places and particular seasons as to the transportation of commodities, and it is doing effective service.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, after consulting with my colleagues on the committee, I shall not make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. If there be anything that is overdone, it is investigations. The Department of Justice, the health officials in the State of Illinois, and in Chicago are making investigations, the State authorities in Massachusetts are making investigations, the municipal authorities in New York are making investigations. It is provided in a resolution that has been reported from the Judiciary Committee that the Federal Trade Commission shall conduct an investigation, to take 18 months, at a cost of \$142,000.

I saw recently a statement made by Mr. Barnes, a member of Parliament, on the 17th day of October, in a debate on the high cost of food in Great Britain. He made the statement that nothing had so angered the people of Great Britain during the past two years as the profit made from foodstuffs consumed by the people except it was the shameless excuses put forth for it by officials of the Government. I believe that statement applies to the situation in this country, except that I would add that nothing has angered them so much as the profit made on foodstuffs except the excuses offered by officials of the Government, and the apparent absolute incapacity and inability of any instrumentality of the Government to cope with the situation.

I have watched the result of numerous investigations conducted by various services by the Federal Government. Ninety-nine per cent of them have resulted in a waste of the expenditure, and without the accomplishment of any beneficial result. I am unwilling to be put in the attitude of saying that the only thing Congress can do for the relief of the present condition is to authorize somebody to conduct an investigation.

There are a number of well-known causes for existing conditions that can be relieved by legislation. I believe that instead of investigating we ought to act, and act in an emphatic manner. I shall not consent to authorize the Bureau of Markets to start with an initial appropriation, an annual expenditure of \$50,000, to make an investigation that will never end and will continually grow without any beneficial results from the expenditure.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with very much that the gentleman from New York has said, but this is a practical method; for the Bureau of Markets can practically aid in economizing in the movement of the food products from the producer to the consumer; not merely for criminal prosecution but giving practical aid. I think anyone must know, and all of those who are engaged in business will admit, that there is a very great lack of economy in the handling and passage of food products from the farm to the home consumption. The very purpose of this is to be a practical and not merely a theoretical investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Why can not some department make some inquiry and some recommendation without large additional expenditures of money?

Mr. MANN. The Bureau of Markets is doing a lot of good work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. They have the organization, they have the equipment, but whenever it is suggested that they can serve or give aid in any way, they always press the necessity of being

permitted to spend a lot of money. They ought to be familiar with conditions in this country about production and the marketing of foodstuffs, and if they have information of value they ought to be able to make a recommendation without the appropriation of \$50,000, which I know from my experience will grow into an exceedingly large appropriation without any possible benefit as the result of it.

Mr. MANN. I think there will be very great compensating benefits. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order; yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the amendment is subject to the point of order, Mr. Chairman. Under the act creating the Department of Agriculture there are authorized appropriations for any matter relating to agriculture or horticulture, in the broadest sense. That covers transportation of the agricultural products. All the items in this bill have been held in order under that provision of the organic act.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Every amendment proposed to the Agricultural bill is not in order. In order to have this amendment held in order the gentleman must submit the law authorizing the expenditure for the work.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; not at all. The law authorizing the expenditure for work—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; the burden is upon the gentleman proposing the amendment to produce the law which authorizes the expenditure.

Mr. MANN. I have produced the law.

Mr. FITZGERALD. My recollection of the organic act of the Department of Agriculture is that it does not in any way, construing it in the most liberal manner, justify any such expenditure as the proposed one. This is not in the interest of agriculture or of horticulture. It is not intended to be in the interest of either. The purpose is to make investigations upon the theory that the Bureau of Markets in some way could propose a remedy for existing high prices of foodstuffs. That does not promote agriculture. You do not promote agriculture by trying to reduce the cost of farm commodities.

Mr. MANN. Of course, the gentleman from New York is not to be blamed for not knowing what agriculture is, because he is not acquainted with it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, there are as many farms in New York City as there are in Chicago.

Mr. MANN. We raise agricultural products in the city of Chicago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. So we do in the city of New York. We are just as progressive and up to date as the gentleman's city. I know the gentleman's solicitude for the Department of Agriculture. Yet there is a limit to what even a friend of the department should do. No one in the department has ever suggested that there could be any profitable result from such an investigation as this. The Department of Agriculture has never overlooked any possible manner in which money might be expended through it, and it did not request this appropriation. We have to stop somewhere. The estimates of the departments this year are \$300,000,000 in excess of the estimated revenues, and without any suggestion or request, and for an object that is purely supposititious as to its benefits, it is now suggested that we initiate expenditures in this direction. If we do not call a halt, there will be no way of ever accomplishing anything in the way of making the revenues meet the expenditures.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an observation regarding the point of order. It occurs to me that it does not require a very strained construction of the organic law to include the language of this proposed amendment. I think it may be considered as being self-evident that a food product in its inception and origin is agricultural. I think the chairman knows that nearly all of the items, at least the general items that are now included in the Agricultural appropriation bill, have come into the bill by rulings from the Chair upon the same class of objections as that now made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, no. When I make them they are sustained.

Mr. TOWNER. All of them have been practically admitted as being within the general provisions of the organic law. I think even the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], whose knowledge of agriculture has been derived from what he has learned from other agriculturists here in the House, would admit that a food product was immediately connected with the subject of agriculture. Although his idea is that the only possible remedy with regard to the high prices of food products is an embargo upon them, I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that even the good people of the city of New York are paying, and have been paying for years,

100 per cent more for the food products they receive than the farmers are receiving for the food products on the farm.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman will permit me to say that I am not only aware of that fact, but the gentleman has not kept up with the progress of events or he would know that the embargo is not the only remedy I have suggested. I have suggested several other equally effective and beneficial remedies.

Mr. TOWNER. The whole question of food products is an agricultural question, pure and simple, in its inception.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman say that canned fish is an agricultural proposition? That is a food product.

Mr. TOWNER. Yes; I presume that is an exception. It must be clear to the Chairman, I think, that this comes under the general provisions of the organic act so clearly that the point of order that the gentleman from New York raises ought to be overruled.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has been made frequently before when the agricultural bill has been under discussion, and some amendment has been proposed to engage in some very large and remotely connected activity. It is always argued that the Agricultural Department covers in a very broad way every possible phase relating to the production and marketing of foods. That argument can be made just as broad as the entire field of human endeavor. The Chairman has universally ruled that the fact that the food had to be produced, marketed, transported, and sold did not give the Agricultural Department the right to decide on everything relating to the production of food, which would include all land titles, land values, and land settlement in the country, everything relating to transportation, which would include all interstate commerce, everything relating to manufacture, and everything relating to the retail business, and possibly banking. There is no limit to the number of activities that gentlemen can bring under the organic act creating the Agricultural Department. They could bring all kinds of activity in which the country is engaged, and so the Chairman has universally limited it to the proximate and direct activities of the department. The purpose of this amendment is to conduct an investigation along lines which have been already proposed, which have been before the Judiciary Committee, which have been reported on in this House, which are now pending on the calendar, and that investigation is committed directly to the Federal Trade Commission.

When this question was before the Committee on the Judiciary the question arose whether it should be done by the Agriculture Department or whether it should be done by the Federal Trade Commission. I want to read for the information of the committee a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture on that point.

Mr. MANN. Is this in regard to the point of order?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; this relates to the point of order on the question as to whether the amendment does not broaden the organic act beyond its original scope.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 6, 1916.

Hon. W. P. BORLAND,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BORLAND: You asked me yesterday whether I thought that the inquiry proposed in your resolution should be conducted by the Federal Trade Commission or the Department of Agriculture. I am very definitely of the opinion that it should be conducted by the Federal Trade Commission. I understand that the commission is created to make just such inquiries—

Now, evidently Congress did not intend to duplicate the authority. It created a commission to make such inquiries, and certainly there is a definite limitation on its powers.

It has the requisite powers and, I imagine, a personnel selected with reference to work of this kind. The Department of Agriculture has not all the powers required for this work or a staff selected with reference to such tasks. If it were to undertake work of this kind, it would necessarily duplicate the machinery and activities of the Federal Trade Commission. The department can and is increasingly investigating the marketing and other economic problems involved in the production and distribution of all farm products, including live stock. Its data can well be placed at the disposal of the Federal Trade Commission, and perhaps we could extend our inquiry along other lines the commission might suggest.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, Secretary.

Now, the Secretary of Agriculture had a very definite idea on the subject, and as Congress had created the commission with its proper powers, with proper machinery, it, ipse dixit, resulted in a limitation of the otherwise very vague powers that might be attributed to the Department of Agriculture. But, as I say, the complete answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] is that there is no inquiry on earth that he could not bring to bear under the powers of the Department of Agriculture by such an argument. He could bring an inquiry into the present railroad situation under such an interpretation of its powers, and so it must appear to the Chairman that there is a reasonable

limitation of the general words involved in the organic law relating to the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, it is more or less immaterial to me what branch of the Government service shall conduct the investigation proposed in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I am interested, however, that some investigation shall be made. At this moment, however, I am more interested in the correct attitude of the Chair on this proposition, for the reason that an erroneous interpretation of the authority of the Department of Agriculture might in the future very materially hamper the development of that great department along the best lines of endeavor. If the Chairman will examine the language which he has before him creating the Department of Agriculture he will observe that the department is created for the purpose of investigating all problems of agriculture, and then the language follows, "agriculture in its broadest and most comprehensive sense." One of the interesting studies that has come to me in my service on the Committee on Agriculture has been the evolution that has taken place in the agriculture of this country. Not only that, but an equally interesting study has been that of the evolution of the rulings of the Chair itself upon the Agriculture appropriation bill. When I first became a member of the Committee on Agriculture I think the Chair would have then held that two-thirds of the items carried in this bill were subject to points of order. Within the past five or six years at least, the Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole have been becoming more and more liberal in their interpretation of the meaning of the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture.

If the Chair will give me its attention for just a moment I want to impress this thought upon the Chair. Agriculture 50 years ago meant one thing; agriculture 25 years ago meant another thing; agriculture to-day means an entirely different thing. If 50 years ago it had been suggested that the marketing of farm products was an agricultural problem you could have gotten very few men to agree to that proposition. Now, every student of agriculture realizes that probably the most important problem of agriculture is that of the distributing of agricultural products. We have evolved in our definition of agriculture from the occupation of producing things to the occupation not only of producing things but of distributing them, and even financing them, and I wish the Chair, in giving its decision upon this proposition, to bear in mind that agriculture does not necessarily confine itself to producing things. Agriculture goes further and concerns itself with distributing things, with marketing things, with getting things produced into the channels of trade, into the channels of consumption. Not only that, but it goes further and concerns itself with the proper financing of things produced and the proper financing of the production itself.

I make that statement because I feel I owe it to the committee of which I am chairman and also to the progress of the Department of Agriculture, which can be very greatly retarded by any restrictive interpretations put upon the language of the organic act by gentlemen who may be serving as Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, under the theory of the gentleman from South Carolina anything that anyone suggests as applicable to agriculture must be held in order upon the Agriculture appropriation bill; otherwise the activities of the department some time in the future may be restricted. This proposed amendment provides for an investigation of certain things, including the extent and manner in which prices are manipulated, either by individuals, groups, associations, or combinations. Granting to the definition of agriculture in its most comprehensive state the most extravagant and wild notions that any gentleman might suggest, he will not be willing, I take it, to insist that agriculture consists in an investigation of the activities of any group of individuals or any combination of corporations or the activities of any produce exchange affecting the prices of foodstuffs. If any such construction be placed upon the organic act or the activities of the Department of Agriculture under the organic act, then there is no department of government, there is no activity of human effort that can not be provided for on the Agricultural bill, because in some way or other indirectly, remote, or purely imaginary it must affect agriculture as defined by the gentleman. I think it is very clear that even the wildest, most extravagant conception of what agriculture in its most comprehensive sense means does not include such an investigation as is proposed in the pending amendment. I submit that it is subject to the point of order which has been interposed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, from time to time a point of order has been made on a very large portion of the items carried

in the Agricultural appropriation bill, and almost invariably the Chair has overruled the point of order and sustained these items under the broad language of the organic act. By examining the act the Chair will notice most of the items in the Agricultural bill will be subject to a point of order if this amendment is subject to a point of order. Take the item just preceding, and if the amendment which I offered is subject to a point of order that item is clearly subject to a point of order. Take the item succeeding, and if the amendment which I have offered is subject to a point of order, then the item in reference to investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton and for investigating the ginning, grading, stapling, baling, marketing, compressing, and the tare of cotton and for testing the waste, tensile strengths, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton is clearly subject to a point of order. The next item would be subject to a point of order; the next item would be subject to a point of order; the next item would be subject to a point of order.

Now, the Chair in the past has held that it was in order to offer an amendment, or that the item in the bill was in order, which dealt with agriculture and horticulture in their broadest sense; and in their broadest sense they cover the movement of the crops. That is all that this amendment contemplates.

The CHAIRMAN. The organic act under which the Department of Agriculture was established has been very liberally construed, and the act—section 520—reads as follows:

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

Now, this amendment carrying out the idea contemplated in that section of the act simply adds, in a reasonable manner, to the scope which is referred to as to the source and use of information. And the Chair thinks, taking that view of the situation, this amendment is clearly in order, and overrules the point of order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we could not arrange for a limit of debate on this amendment?

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to oppose the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto shall close in 30 minutes. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] desires five minutes in support of his amendment, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] five minutes, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] desires five minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] five minutes, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY] five minutes, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] five, and the chairman of the committee might want five. I would ask to make it 35 minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto shall close in 35 minutes, the time to be distributed as he has specified. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I rose at the time, but did not catch the eye of the Chairman. I would like five minutes if the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] will consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] would like to have five minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I tried to get the attention of the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I beg the gentleman's pardon.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I tried to get the attention of the gentleman from South Carolina when he was making the arrangement. I ask for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection to making it 40 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the time will be changed to 40 minutes.

Mr. FARR. I think we had best make it an hour.

Mr. BORLAND. Make it an hour, and you will have some time left.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, in order that there may be no undue limitation of the debate on a matter of this importance I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph be closed in one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and the amendments thereto close in one hour.

Mr. DOWELL. May I inquire if I may have three minutes out of the hour?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Iowa may have three minutes. We will include him in the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, the great vice of this amendment is that it does not go far enough to do any good and is a waste of time, effort, and money in attempting to do what it, on its face, can not do. If the amendment accomplished or could accomplish what it was expected, and on its face purported, to accomplish, it might be worth the money; but under existing circumstances it is a waste of money and, moreover, is dangerous in its tendency to head off an efficient investigation.

But I say it is designed not for the purpose of conducting an investigation such as the public demands but for the very purpose of sidetracking and making impossible the real investigation needed in the premises. There is not a bit of doubt upon that proposition. I am going to put it so clearly that every man in this House who votes on the proposition will know that if he votes "aye" on this resolution he is voting against any real investigation of the subject.

We introduced a resolution—the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOOLITTLE] and myself—nearly a year ago in regard to the marketing of live stock. We have had hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary, and at those hearings the representatives of the packing houses and all their high-priced attorneys appeared and defended. A year ago, in October, 1915, there was a hearing of the Bureau of Markets in Chicago, designed to conduct an investigation such as that provided for in the Mann amendment. They had full power to do it, and did it without any Mann amendment. They could not get anybody to appear at such an investigation except voluntarily, and the representatives of the packing houses of Chicago snapped their fingers at that kind of an investigation.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. I wish I had the time to yield, but I have not. The men who were guilty refused to disclose the evidence. Then we came to the conclusion that an investigation by the Bureau of Markets was not a terror to the evildoers, and the Secretary of Agriculture agreed with us in that position, and we went before the Committee on the Judiciary and asked for an investigation by the Federal Trade Commission. Why? Because the Federal Trade Commission has power to subpoena witnesses and compel them to testify.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. BORLAND. I wish I could, but I can not. There is the whole crux of the situation. You are to have a choice between an investigation by a body that has the power to compel the production of testimony and a department of the Government that has no such power.

Now, mark me: When we were making this battle before the Committee on the Judiciary every packing-house manager and every packing-house attorney was urging a resolution similar to the Mann amendment, and we were fighting it. The whole issue between the farmers and the stock raisers on one side and the packing houses on the other was whether there should be a compulsory production of evidence.

Now, mark you: The Mann amendment does not and will not and can not provide for anything but voluntary testimony. Nobody is afraid of that amendment. Every packing-house attorney in the land will support the Mann amendment. Let no man make a mistake on that subject. Every man who is opposed to an investigation of the manipulation of prices will support the Mann amendment. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask unanimous consent—I do not know what the scope of the order is—to have unanimous consent to read at this time the resolution finally reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, which it is attempted to displace by this proposed amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the resolution will be read.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let it be known that this comes out of the hour or not. I am not willing to extend the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. I have no objection, provided it comes out of the hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution (H. Res. 389) directing the Federal Trade Commission to investigate and report to the House of Representatives the facts relating to the production, marketing, and distribution of food products in the United States, together with any violations of the antitrust laws in connection therewith, and recommendations for greater economy and efficiency in the marketing of food products and the punishment and prevention of extortion in the prices thereof.

Whereas an adequate and wholesome supply of food products at reasonable prices is vital to the life of the Nation and is becoming more important year by year as the number of citizens engaged in industrial pursuits increases, thereby enlarging the number of the consumers at a greater ratio than the number of producers; and

Whereas the scale of wages paid for labor of all classes is to be measured not in dollars and cents but in the purchasing power of such wages in the commodities necessary for comfortable existence; and

Whereas there has been a large and growing demand for all classes of American products, including food products, growing out of the war in Europe with its destruction and demoralization of the ordinary processes of peace and its unprecedented demand for commissary supplies for vast armies in the field; and

Whereas the problem of the food supply for the Nation involves the three coordinate elements of, first, production of the raw supply; second, its preparation and transportation for consumption; and, third, its distribution to the consumer, and sound economic laws require that each of these elements be maintained at the highest stage of efficiency which involves a reasonable profit to attract labor and capital to such operations, and involves also a reasonable price to the consumer measured in the standard of the earnings of the industrial worker, and none of these elements can be considered separately without demoralizing the economic system; and

Whereas in the United States we have not yet begun to reach the limit of our efficient production of food products and are capable of infinitely higher efficiency in that direction if a fair, open, and free market could be maintained between those engaged in the production of food products and those who ultimately consume the same: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federal Trade Commission be, and it is hereby, directed under the authority of the act entitled "An act to create the Federal Trade Commission, define its powers and duties, and for other purposes," approved September 26, 1914, to investigate and report to the House of Representatives at the earliest moment practicable the basic facts relating to the production, transportation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of food supplies.

Second. The cause or causes of the present shortage and high prices of the same in view of the tremendous productive capacity of this country.

Third. Whether the apparent shortage of supply and high prices are due to any conspiracy, combination, contract, or practices in restraint of trade on the part of any person, groups, associations, or corporations engaged in any of such processes, and especially whether and what violations of the antitrust laws exist in such processes.

Fourth. The extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of food products by any individuals, groups, associations, or corporations, and especially those engaged in the slaughtering and marketing of meat products, and also in the storage and distribution of poultry, eggs, butter, and dairy products, fresh fruits and vegetables, wheat and other cereals, and whether there is a joint control by any person, groups, associations, or corporations of the storing, preparation, marketing, and distribution of said products.

Fifth. What, if any, legislation is needed to insure the maximum of profitable production of food products in this country together with the free and open channel of distribution of the same to the wage earners and consumers at prices which shall insure a large and steady supply and be within the purchasing power of fair industrial wages.

Sec. 2. That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to direct the several departments and bureaus of the United States Government, and in particular the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Markets and Rural Organization therein, to furnish to the said Federal Trade Commission, upon its request, papers, information, and data in their possession, respectively, relating to any of the matters herein required to be investigated, and to detail from time to time such officials and employees to the commission as it may request for the purposes of conducting said investigation and preparing said report.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is nobody who wants to talk, the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not know at this time whether I shall vote for or against the so-called Mann amendment, but I do wish to call attention to the fact that the Bureau of Markets, which may be a very useful bureau in the Department of Agriculture, has been recently created, and that in this bill provision is made for it and for the general expenses for various branches of work that it is to conduct, to the extent of \$794,395. We are appropriating here for the first time approximately \$800,000 for the purpose of enabling the Bureau of Markets to disseminate information as between the farmer or the producer and the consumer. That seems to be a very large appropriation for that purpose, since we are just about engaging in that particular line of governmental oversight.

The Mann amendment proposes an appropriation of \$50,000 additional for the purpose of making an investigation into the

high cost of living with respect to its domination by manufacturers, corporations, or otherwise; and my inquiry is, Why is the Bureau of Markets, with \$289,400 appropriated to it, for the specific purpose of "acquiring and diffusing among the people necessary useful information upon subjects connected with the marketing and diffusion of nonmanufactured food products, and so forth, not already sufficiently provided with money to make this \$50,000 investigation, more especially as the Department of Justice, after a long agitation for action on the part of some of the Government departments, has finally undertaken an inquiry on its own account and has published at least several reports with respect to the causes of the high cost of living?

If you will take this bill, pages 74, 75, 76, and a part of 77, covering the appropriations to the Bureau of Markets, you will observe that we are providing for a great variety of kinds of information to be acquired by "experts" to be given to the people on this very question of the high cost of living. What else is the Bureau of Markets for? Why are we providing this \$800,000, approximately, to this bureau? Is it only to give employment to additional men, only to find more "experts" to put upon the Government pay roll, eventually to come forward and ask for a pension for the patriotic services they have rendered the Government? Why another \$50,000 at this time, when this present administration is charged time and time again, not only with the power by law but with appropriations backing up that law to make every possible kind of investigation which the ingenuity of man can invent as to the high cost of living and the various other troubles from which the country suffers at the present time?

We have asked for three or four years why the Department of Justice did not proceed against some of these alleged malefactors of great wealth who are supposed to be responsible for the high cost of living. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] brought in his resolution, not at this session, but at the last session, asking that some action be taken with regard to the so-called Beef Trust in this country. What efforts have been made by the present administration, what action has been taken by the present administration, looking either to the passage of that resolution or to the exercise of any of the governmental functions under existing law to find out whether the so-called Beef Trust has been putting excessive prices upon the people or not?

The best we have now from the Department of Justice, in consequence of such investigation as it has made, is that the car shortage is responsible for the high cost of living. According to the report of the investigators it is not the war in Europe, but it is the shortage of cars. The Beef Trust is entirely overlooked in any report that we have had up to the present time as to the reason for the increase in the cost of living. There seems to be ample authority to make investigations if the administration will only investigate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the Committee on Agriculture had had an opportunity to consider the substance of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], probably a broader proposition would have been submitted to the committee. But this proposition is now before the committee. It is not as broad and comprehensive in its scope as I would have it, and if I did not know that any very great broadening of the amendment would subject all of it to a point of order I should offer a much broader proposition. But it seems to me that the committee is confronted with a situation which it can not escape considering. The press of the country, the magazines of the country, economic writers, and students of the food situation of the country are all agreed that a situation exists which demands the most careful inquiry on the part of legislators. The proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is to enable the Department of Agriculture, through its machinery already organized, and through additional machinery, if necessary, to investigate the production, transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of agricultural food products, including the extent, manner, and method of any manipulation of the market or control of the visible supply of such food products, and so forth. Not speaking for the committee, but for myself, I do not feel personally that I am willing to oppose an amendment which undertakes to obtain light on a matter of such supreme importance as the food supply of this Nation at this time.

Mr. HAUGEN. Does the gentleman think that the amendment gives the department any authority beyond what it now has?

Mr. LEVER. I think the department is not given any additional authority, but I do think that the department is given additional direction to do certain things which the department

so far has not felt that it should do without a direction from Congress to do it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman had made that statement when the point of order was under discussion, the point of order must have been sustained, because any attempt to control a department, under the repeated and unbroken rulings of the Chair, is subject to a point of order. Of course, the amendment was clearly subject to a point of order, as the gentleman and myself well know.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will permit me, he will remember that the gentleman from South Carolina did not express any view as to whether this amendment was in order or out of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, yes; the gentleman appealed to the Chair to be careful as to how he ruled, not to restrict the activities of the department by an erroneous ruling; and if he had not intended to mislead the Chair, he ought to have told the Chair what he had in his mind.

Mr. LEVER. I was about to say, when I was interrupted the second time, that I am satisfied, after thought on this proposition, that the ruling of the Chair is not out of line with the holdings of Chairmen of the Committee of the Whole on this bill during the last four or five years. The Chair has given a rather liberal interpretation to the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture, but I think not too liberal an interpretation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It could not be any more liberal.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman will recall the fact that the department has carried on investigations such as are directed in this amendment and that the department reported back to the committee that it was without authority required to successfully carry on the investigation. The danger in passing this amendment seems to be that it will defeat the very purpose sought by the investigation authorized by the Borland resolution. Furthermore it is contrary to the recommendation made by the Secretary of Agriculture and representatives of the beef producers and consumers. Is it not better to leave the question to those interested and who have given the subject due consideration to act upon suggestions made by the Secretary of Agriculture, the producers, and consumers, rather than to adopt suggestions made by those charged with violation of law to the Committee on the Judiciary, as stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND]?

Mr. LEVER. I do not know what is the motive back of this proposition. I assume that the motive is to get information upon a subject that is more largely in the public mind to-day than any other proposition I know of, except the European war. I do feel that the Congress and the people of the United States are entitled to such an investigation. As far as I am concerned, I do not care whether it is made by the Department of Agriculture or by the Federal Trade Commission, or whether both of these organizations act at once. If both of these services should conduct separate and independent investigations upon a matter of this great importance, I do not feel that that paralleling of service would be a waste of money, because it seems to me that the time has come for the American people to act, to prevent in the future the doing of things by great concerns with respect to foodstuffs that are now subjecting them to the severe criticism of the public, who think that they are paying the cost. As a legislator I do not hesitate to say that I want the greatest possible light upon this situation, and I want that light pouring in from every possible angle, because as legislators we can not legislate with clearness, with comprehension, with sanity, and with safety, unless we know all the facts. I myself would be very glad to support a resolution, even at this moment, to have the Federal Trade Commission set on foot an independent investigation. I want to know what their experts think. I want to know what the experts of the Department of Agriculture think. I would like to know what the experts of the Department of Justice think. There is no other question that is so pressing as this, and there is no legislation in the future that is going to affect more intimately the lives of the people of this country than that legislation which must come sooner or later, safeguarding the people against manipulation and monopolistic control of the food of the country. As far as I am concerned, I repeat that personally I want light, and too much light is not going to disturb me. The more the better; and the more light, the sooner the legislation and the better the result for the people of the country in the end. That is my personal position.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman is looking for results, then I take it he will agree with me that the investigation should be carried on by some commission or some body with authority. If so, as has been stated by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr.

BORLAND], the Federal Trade Commission has the power to subpoena witnesses. The Department of Agriculture has no power to subpoena witnesses. As the gentleman knows, the department carried on an investigation, and reported back to the committee that it did not have the necessary authority. It has been carrying on investigations, and it will continue to carry on investigations which under the appropriation it has the authority to carry on, and as the gentleman has stated, the resolution gives the committee no additional authority. It occurs to me, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Missouri, that you are transferring the investigation suggested from a commission with authority to a bureau without the required authority, and thus defeat the more effective investigation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] is really seeking light, he is taking a very peculiar way of obtaining it. If this amendment be adopted and this additional appropriation be made, it will not be available until the 1st of July, and the investigation can not be initiated for at least six months. The gentleman from South Carolina states that the question is important and pressing at present, but his remedy is to begin an investigation six months from now in order to obtain light upon it; to begin an investigation by a branch of the Government that has no authority to do more than inquire and obtain voluntary statements from the persons whom they are to investigate. The gentleman from South Carolina states that, in his opinion, this proposed amendment gives no additional authority to the Bureau of Markets. The Bureau of Markets, for the purpose of acquiring and diffusing among the people of the United States information on subjects connected with the marketing and distribution of farm and unmanufactured food products, has an appropriation of \$289,400. If it gets no additional authority under this amendment, the only thing the amendment does is to increase the fund available by \$50,000. The bureau has not asked for it. It does not want it. Simply because the gentleman from South Carolina needs light he wants to have it furnished to him from some source or other, and wishes to give the Bureau of Agriculture \$50,000 that it does not want and can not use for any profitable purpose. That is not the purpose of the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture. The province of this bill is to carry appropriations that are essential for the proper conduct of the business of the Government and not to make futile appropriations that will be of no use whatever.

Mr. Chairman, those who want information upon this subject need not wait for investigations. There have been innumerable investigations conducted by various governmental instrumentalities that fix plainly and clearly some of the causes for many of the evils from which we are suffering. There is some legislation that would meet the approval practically of all Members of this body that could be enacted to meet the existing situation. Of course, those who do not want any action, those who do not wish legislation to relieve existing conditions, may well, perhaps, as an excuse for no action, support a proposition to commence six months from now an investigation of conditions about which there is universal protest at this time. That may serve as a good excuse for doing nothing that will be valuable, and it will be an effective remedy to prevent action that will be beneficial.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I guess the gentleman's complaint at this time is that Congress has not seriously taken his proposition for an embargo on foodstuffs.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that a question?

Mr. LEVER. No; that is a statement.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman took some of my valuable time under false pretenses. [Laughter.] He should not be guilty of such practices. I have not made any such complaint, Mr. Chairman. When I have a grievance about this body or any other department of the Government, I do not rely upon other gentlemen to express it. I have been in the habit of making very clear my attitude toward either the House or any other branch of the Government because of its failures. I have no doubt that some of the things I propose, to those who are uninformed, may seem ineffective, but to those who are familiar with the situation, who do not need this superabundance of light for which the gentleman from South Carolina is praying and hoping and expecting from a very valuable branch of the Government service, this remedy is not so ephemeral as he imagines. I hope the amendment will not be adopted, because I consider it an indefensible waste of the public funds.

Mr. QUIN. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN],

and I certainly think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] was harsh in his statement when he said that those who favored the Mann amendment favored no investigation. For one, I am in favor of the bill of the gentleman from Missouri, but while it is on the calendar we all know that it can not go through without a special rule, and the close of the session is near at hand. We do know that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois will seek to give light to the country and perhaps prevent the manipulations of food supply and monopolistic tendencies to control farm products.

The gentleman from New York introduced a bill here to place an embargo on food products for the purpose of lowering the price of products to the consumer of the United States. I want to say to the gentleman that the farmers have for a long time been looking for just and reasonable prices for their products, and the first time in the history of this country for the last 15 or 20 years when the man behind the plow is receiving fair consideration for his labor, the gentleman from New York, or some other man, hollers out "embargo," to lower the price of farm products. This amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is just to the producer of the products of the farm and to the consumers of this country. The gentleman's amendment proposes that no wrong be done anybody, and that the square thing may be done to the man who raises the farm products and the man in the city who consumes them. He proposes that an investigation shall be made by the machinery of the Bureau of Markets to see whether or not there has been an unfair manipulation in storage in the control of beef and all farm products, and that is what this country is entitled to. The people know that something is radically wrong. They know that when the price of a commodity leaves the farm for a reasonable sum that when it advances several hundred per cent by the time it reaches the consumer, something is unfair in the proceeding. The amendment before the House now will establish who that is, and will strike down the instrumentalities that now, under cover of law, are robbing both the producers and consumers. The gentleman from Missouri seems to think that there is no remedy on earth except his bill. We know that his bill may never be passed, and we know that the House of Representatives can now pass this amendment which carries with it the sum of \$50,000, which will enable the Bureau of Markets to carry out an effort to find out what these evils are and to make recommendations for their cure. We realize the fact that the poor in the cities of this country suffer because food is too high. We know at the same time that the man on the farm is not receiving too much for his product, so that some person in the middle, some instrumentality, is guilty of a wrong that squeezes the city consumer and injures the farmer. [Applause.]

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have in my hand the hearings conducted by the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on the Borland resolution, containing 545 pages. In these hearings, and the printed report, is shown conclusively what the packers of the country want, and what the producers, at least a majority of them, and also the consumers of the country prefer in the way of an investigation. The hearings show that the packers, and possibly other food manipulators, are in favor of the Bureau of Markets conducting an investigation, in the face of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Houston, has stated over his signature in a letter which was read this morning by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND] that the Department of Agriculture was not in a position to make this investigation, and that the Bureau of Markets did not have the facilities, or words to that effect.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. When was the resolution of the gentleman from Missouri reported by the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. DOOLITTLE. December 21, 1916. Already there has been an attempt to make a sort of investigation by the Bureau of Markets, and the head of that bureau, Mr. Charles J. Brand, held a meeting in Chicago, to which representatives of the packing houses and representatives of beef producers and others were invited. The packing-house people did not appear. They took very little interest in it. The meeting was not satisfactory either to the producers of the country or to the consumers. This meeting was held November 15 and 16, 1915, in the city of Chicago, and was a complete disappointment to all who were connected with it or interested in the subject of an investigation. That was an investigation similar to what could be held under the provisions of the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if it should prevail, because the Bureau of Markets has no power to issue subpoenas, to compel the produc-

tion of books, or to administer oaths. The packers of the country have insisted that that is the kind of investigation that they want, if there is to be one—that it shall be done by the Bureau of Markets. They are very much opposed, as they have said in their testimony, a copy of which I hold in my hand, to the Federal Trade Commission, which is equipped to make a scientific and intelligent investigation, making such an investigation.

Mr. Fisher, a former member of the Cabinet, the attorney for the American National Live Stock Association and others interested in the cattle business, says in his testimony, which I have here, that they want to employ every legitimate agency for getting at the bottom of the business; that the Bureau of Markets can not make the investigation, and that the same should be made by the Federal Trade Commission—that is, that they propose to have the whole economic matter investigated from the birth of the steer until it is finally consumed. It seems to me that if the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] prevails, that would be tantamount to sidetracking entirely the long efforts that have been put forth by the friends of the producers and consumers in trying to get a real investigation into the high cost of living and the packers' manipulation of live-stock markets.

Mr. SUMNERS. Mr. Chairman, I have spoken very infrequently in this House. Under the five-minute rule I must speak very briefly now. I rise to oppose this amendment for the reason that the first part of the amendment covers matters with regard to which the Bureau of Markets is already dealing, and for which appropriation to the full limit of its estimates is being made in this bill. This is admitted.

The other provision in the amendment is to direct an examination by the Bureau of Markets of the manipulation of prices of farm products. The manipulation of prices, gentlemen understand, is now a violation of the criminal laws of the United States. I want to put it straight to you. If you adopt this amendment you put upon the Bureau of Markets the responsibility of exercising an inquisitorial power with reference to a crime, when you know that the Bureau of Markets does not possess inquisitorial powers. You can not get away from that proposition. The Bureau of Markets can not compel the attendance of witnesses, the production of documents, or even administer oath to those witnesses who voluntarily attend. An investigation by a department of the Government, bereft of the power necessary for an effective investigation, will of necessity be a farce. To my mind, it is palpably ridiculous to authorize the expenditure of the public funds by this bureau for that purpose when we have a Department of Justice and a Trade Commission created for the very purpose of investigating matters of this sort, clothed with the power to subpoena witnesses, to compel the presentation of documents, to administer oath, and to do all those things necessary to make an effective investigation, and to ascertain the real facts.

The Bureau of Markets, gentlemen of the House must know, can find out only the things from those being investigated which they want to have made known. There can be no question about that. There would be just as much practical sense in sending an unarmed private citizen without warrant to receive the surrender of a defiant criminal, to be delivered over to the sheriff, whose duty it is to make the arrest, and who is armed and equipped with process to make it, as to send the Bureau of Markets, without inquisitorial power, to get information to turn over to the Department of Justice, which has full inquisitorial power. This Bureau of Markets is being sent to do this in the very face of the fact that it is within the knowledge of the gentlemen of this committee that when it did undertake to investigate Chicago packing houses the representatives of those houses refused to appear before the representatives of the bureau and refused to give any testimony before them, and the bureau was powerless in the face of that refusal. This bureau, if it makes an investigation, will be compelled to report that it has not been able to find conclusive evidence of criminal manipulation of the price of farm products, and we will be in the attitude of having directed it to make this investigation when we knew in advance that it did not have the power to force a disclosure of the facts of criminal manipulation of the price of farm products even if those facts existed. I am unwilling to place myself in that attitude and I am unwilling to spend the public money in any such farcical undertaking. I am willing to spend any amount of money necessary to support that arm of the Government, the Department of Justice, or the Trade Commission, in the making of a real investigation of this matter and in the prosecution of those who may be found to be guilty. We will get a report back for this \$50,000 and some statistics which will be filed away in a

pigeonhole. I am getting tired of spending the public money gathering statistics which are never used.

The departments of this Government are bursting open now with dead information. There is not an intelligent man in America who has given any investigation and thought to this matter who does not understand, in a general way at least, the big problems with regard to which we must deal when we undertake to lessen the cost of the American table. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. The Bureau of Markets has been digging into this thing for three years, and the head of that bureau knows at this very moment everything that he could know that would help him in his work when he shall have expended the \$50,000 carried by this amendment. What we want of the Bureau of Markets is constructive work, to build a machine that will shorten the distance between the field of production and points of consumption, that will stay the waste in distribution. That is its business. That is what it is equipped to do. It can not trail criminals. Why send it after them when we know that is not its business and it can not catch them? Why, I say, do this if we want to catch the criminals? That is the business of the Department of Justice.

I submit this proposed legislation is as ridiculous as would be a proposition to have the Department of Justice expend a large sum of money investigating the matter of paper containers for farm products shipped for sale when we have a Bureau of Markets organized, equipped, and educated for that very purpose. Why turn aside the efforts of the Bureau of Markets from that which it ought to do and is equipped to do and embarrass it by putting upon it a responsibility which it is not equipped to discharge?

If crime is being committed and we want to apprehend and punish the criminals, why send after the criminals a branch of the Government which does not have to do with criminal prosecutions or the detection of criminals? I am a friend of the Bureau of Markets. It has much to do. It can do much. It has yet to create a clearing house of information where the man who has something to sell can list it by type or grade, and where the man who wants to buy can have access to it, where the man who lives in the remotest producing district of this country can have access to every market, and where the most remote market in this country can have access to every field of production. When we do that and give to the Federal Government the necessary supervisory power to insure to both the producer and the consumer integrity of transaction, then we will substantially reduce the cost of living and will insure a more satisfactory reward to producers.

The building of the machine which will make that possible is the business of the Bureau of Markets, not spending the people's money in undertakings foreign to its business and which not itself but another branch of the Government is equipped to do and charged with the duty of doing.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, that there is some reason for an investigation I think no one has yet questioned or will question. The method of the investigation is the question in controversy. On the other side of the House you have all the machinery, if put in motion, to make the most rigid examination, if you so desire—

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. DOWELL. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman controvert the statement made here that the Bureau of Markets has no authority to send for persons or papers or require anybody to testify?

Mr. DOWELL. I am not questioning that authority.

Mr. GORDON. What good does it do but to spend the money?

Mr. DOWELL. I am simply making the statement that upon that side of the House you have made many claims and you have introduced resolutions to solve the high cost of living, but you have not put into operation a single particle of machinery of the Government to put it into effect. You can pass the Borland resolution in 48 hours if you desire to pass it; but you have made no progress on the subject of passing the resolution, and the House has no knowledge when the resolution will be presented, if at all. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FRIZZGARD] has attempted to solve the problem by introducing a resolution to put an embargo on foodstuffs, but that resolution has never seen the light since it was presented here early in the session. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that this session is fast drawing to a close, and if you are going to do anything on this subject the time to do it is near at hand. So far as I am concerned, I put it up to you, gentlemen. If you want to solve this question, you have the machinery, when put in operation, to solve it, and there is no reason to stand here and

object to any kind of an investigation because you have some other method that is being held behind. I favor some action on this subject. I know the people of the country demand some action, and I believe all of the facts should be brought forth and that Congress should put into operation every force it has in the solution of this problem. I believe it is the duty of you in the majority, who have the machinery and can act, to put some method into effect, and I am sure you will have the approval of the people if you do it. [Applause.]

Mr. RUBEN. Mr. Chairman, I am going to vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and I am also going to vote, if I get an opportunity, for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri, my colleague [Mr. BORLAND], which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. I can not for the life of me see why the putting of this little amendment into this bill will prevent this House at some future day, before the 4th of next March, from passing the Borland resolution. The resolution which has been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary is certainly a resolution that ought to be passed. The investigation ought to be made in that manner, and yet I do not know, no Member of this House knows, whether or not we will have an opportunity to vote for the Borland resolution, and I propose here now to record my vote for this pending amendment notwithstanding the fact that my colleague from Missouri in his enthusiasm characterizes every man who supports it as being opposed to any investigation whatever. He has no right to characterize my vote in that way. I am in favor of every possible means of investigation. I want every bit of information we can get from every source possible along this particular line.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUBEN. I will.

Mr. GORDON. Other than simply wasting \$50,000, what good will an investigation do made by a bureau which has no power to send for persons or papers or compel anyone to answer? What information will they get that will do anybody any good?

Mr. RUBEN. I will answer by quoting from the resolution introduced by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND], in which the second section provides—

Mr. GORDON. But that is not before the House.

Mr. RUBEN. Well, maybe it will come before the House. That section provides that the Trade Commission shall get every bit of information it can, and it says that it shall get information from the Office of the Bureau of Markets and Rural Organization, and directs that bureau to furnish to the Federal Trade Commission upon its request papers and information and everything which it itself has. If given \$50,000, the Bureau of Markets can go ahead with further investigations, get the information, transmit it to the Federal Trade Commission, and so assist them in their investigation.

I say we ought to agree to this amendment and adopt it as a part of this bill, and then if we get a chance between now and the 1st of March we should take up the Borland resolution and pass it.

Mr. BORLAND. Will my colleague yield before he sits down?

Mr. RUBEN. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. On page 75 of the bill is an item which appeared for the first time last year, giving an appropriation of \$66,800 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to gather from stockmen, live-stock associations, and so forth, all of this information that is called for now in the Mann resolution. The bill contains an item of \$66,800, which covers the very evidence that the Bureau of Markets can collect, which will aid in the passage of the Borland resolution.

Mr. RUBEN. There is no question but that the information referred to by my friend from Missouri is valuable information, and the department is now, under the provisions of that law which went into effect on the 11th day of August last, working along that particular line. But they can go out and get additional information, and that information will be valuable. The bureau has able and competent men who, if authorized to do so, can get valuable information. They can not, of course, go out—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MANN. How much time is there remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Five minutes remaining of the hour.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it in order to offer an amendment after the expiration of the hour for debate?

Mr. MANN. It is; but it will not be debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House all debate is closed. The order just extends to the debate on this amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Then it will be in order to offer an amendment?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Did I understand the debate had expired?

The CHAIRMAN. When the hour agreed to by the committee has expired, all debate on this amendment to this paragraph will be closed.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet trying to get recognition from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN]. The time has been allotted.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. The time has been allotted?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN] is recognized.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have always voted against investigations and the creation of commissions for the purpose of conducting investigations. I think the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], a few minutes ago, vindicates my position during the past six years on these various investigations. The gentleman from New York stated that of the thousands of dollars expended for investigations 90 per cent of the amount was wasted—did no good. A commission is a good thing for those on the commission who draw the salaries. An investigation seldom, if ever, benefits anybody else. The American people favored the restriction of immigration. There was practically no difference of opinion as to the necessity for that legislation, but in order to postpone action Congress created a commission which lasted year after year, and in the end cost \$1,000,000, and the publication of 30 or 40 volumes of testimony which nobody read. Congress knew in advance that the legislation was in the interests of the country, and yet wasted year after year and a million dollars in finding out something a majority of Congress knew in advance. That investigation was ordered 10 years ago. We have never yet written the legislation on the statute books. We spent in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses thousands upon thousands of dollars for investigations.

First, the United States Steel Corporation was investigated. Who has ever read the testimony? What effect did it have? Then we investigated the so-called Sugar Trust. Who read the testimony? What legislation has resulted from either one of those expensive and unnecessary investigations? Absolutely none. Then we investigated the Colorado coal and Michigan copper strikes because some members of the Colorado and Michigan delegations wanted them investigated. We sent special committees to Colorado and Michigan to investigate the strikes there, and we piled up volume after volume of testimony, costing thousands of dollars; but where is the legislation? That was another waste of time and money. What the American people demand to-day is not additional investigations. They are weary of investigations. The people want prompt action on the part of the national administration and a Democratic Congress in redeeming the promise of four years ago to reduce the high cost of living. If, as charged by those on the Democratic side of the House, there are unlawful combinations to increase the high cost of living, what has become of the Attorney General of the United States and his district attorneys located in every State of the Union? What are they doing to have the law carried out and to aid their party in keeping the platform pledge to enforce the Sherman antitrust law and to reduce the high cost of living? If you are determined to have an investigation, in all fairness you should begin with the Department of Justice. Do we need an investigation to convince us that there is an increase in the cost of living or that there are combinations? What the country needs and is entitled to is a prompt remedy for conditions every Member of Congress knows to exist all over the country. Let us quit feeding a trusting public on promises, on investigations, and get down to real business. Let us have another "administration measure"—not an expensive and unnecessary investigation, but a law to reduce the high cost of living, as promised in the Baltimore platform.

The investigations referred to in this debate, if ordered, will last for months, cost thousands of dollars, and in the meantime there will be no relief for the people. Quit investigating, quit postponing, and direct your Attorney General to get busy. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, let me say for the benefit of some of the gentlemen that this amendment was not prepared by, it was not shown to, it was not discussed with, packers, and they know nothing about it, and nobody else, so far as discussion in advance is concerned, outside of Members of the House. Let me make this further suggestion: The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] said this would postpone an investigation. I did not put in the amendment a provision that the funds should be immediately available, because that would have made it subject to the point of order which the gentleman from New York made, but I am quite willing that that should be added to the amendment. I did not put in it the provision giving the bureau the power to subpoena witnesses, because that would have made it subject to the point of order, but I am quite willing they should have it. However, let me make this suggestion with reference to the subpoenaing of witnesses:

I had charge of the bill, originally, creating the Bureau of Corporations. They were given power to subpoena witnesses. They never did it. The Federal Trade Commission, I think—although I may be mistaken—has never subpoenaed a witness. Why? Witnesses who are willing to come do come. The minute you subpoena a witness you render him immune from prosecution. And those under investigation, under prosecution, are the most anxious to testify, because they can not be prosecuted. And when the Bureau of Corporations made an investigation of the packers some years ago, although they did not subpoena witnesses, the packers got an immunity bath because the Bureau of Corporations had power to subpoena witnesses where the production of testimony gave that immunity if done.

Now, what have we proposed? A practical method of expediting economy in the transportation of food products from the producer to the consumer, using a method which we have already created, the Bureau of Markets, engaged in that business, men who can make suggestions to the men who handle the grains, the live stock, and the other food products of the country, and make suggestions which would be of practical value. If they discover that there is manipulation of the markets, they will discover it outside of giving immunity to the men who are engaged in the business, and they will have the power to turn that testimony over to the Department of Justice, where it may be effective.

If we could—and I do not know whether we can; we have not been able to yet—if we could send one man to jail for manipulating the markets of the country, it would do more good than anything else we could do. [Applause.]

But up to date we have not been able to do anything. Where we have made an investigation we have granted immunity to the men who are guilty by making the investigation, and the investigation has done no good in any other way.

Now, this investigation, if carried on, may be of good, to begin with, in giving practical suggestions for the handling of the food products, and if they discover that there is manipulation of the market, then the men who are guilty will not have immunity. They may indict and convict. I hope the amendment may receive the approval of the body. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CRISP). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON to the amendment offered by Mr. MANN: "For the purpose of said investigation the Chief of the Bureau of Markets and his duly authorized agents shall have power to administer oaths, subpoena witnesses, and require the production of books and papers."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment: Insert at the end of the amendment the words "to be immediately available."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. MANN: At the end of the amendment, after the figures "\$50,000," insert the words "to be immediately available."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I ask for a division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 85, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the handling, grading, and transportation of grain, including the grain sorghums, for the purpose of fixing definite grades thereof, \$106,590.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin reserves a point of order on the paragraph. The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the grain standards act passed last year has not yet been placed in operation. A committee of the Department of Agriculture is now engaged in preparing standard grades for the grading of grain, that is to say, deciding upon definitions of what shall constitute the various grades. This is a task of tremendous importance to the farmers of the Nation and also to the consumers of grain products.

Mr. Chairman, heretofore the grades for wheat have been fixed according to the weight and appearance of the grain. The entire equipment of those who have attempted to fix standard grades in the different States has consisted of a scale, the naked eye, and the fingers of the hand as to moisture. It is the contention of the farmers of the Northwest that standard grades for wheat should be determined upon according to its actual milling value. That value can be actually and scientifically ascertained; in fact, it has been done at the experimental flour mill and laboratories of the North Dakota Agricultural College by President E. F. Ladd. The experiments conducted there during recent years show that grades established according to weight and physical appearance are inaccurate, unscientific, and grossly unjust to the producers. The grades have been heretofore adopted in an arbitrary way and apparently for the express purpose of buying a large portion of the wheat at less than its milling value. Even if this were not the design, no thoughtful person will say that it is not the effect. In my remarks here last year concerning the 1915 crop I showed that there was in some instances a spread in price between No. 1 northern and rejected at 20 cents per bushel, that is to say for 60 pounds. Dr. Ladd showed by his milling, chemical, and baking tests that the actual value of the products of the rejected grade were worth more according to the market prices than the products of No. 1 northern, as follows: No. 1 northern, \$2.28 per 100 pounds; rejected grade, \$2.31 per 100 pounds. In other words, and do not lose sight of this, while rejected was actually worth more than No. 1 northern, the Minnesota authorities had arbitrarily established six grades to describe wheat ranging between these limits of quality. By this means the man who hauled a load of wheat of rejected grade to the elevator on April 27, 1916, according to the market reports in the Grand Forks Herald, received 20 cents per bushel less than his wheat was really worth, that is to say 20 cents less than the quotation for No. 1 northern.

This year it is worse than ever. The grain dealers are buying wheat upon the basis of nine different grades. The more grades there are the lower they can pound down the price for the so-called low-grade wheat. This year—that is, for the crop year of 1916—the spread in price between No. 1 northern and the lowest grade has run at times as great as 97 cents per bushel. It represents the most colossal hold-up ever pulled off in the grain trade.

Mr. Chairman, let me say again the grading of grain or the fixing of standards in the past has always been done simply by weight and by the physical appearance of the grain. The different States or other organizations that have adopted standard grades have never attempted to go further than that. They have never attempted to make a chemical analysis of the grain or analysis of the flour or any baking tests of the flour.

The College of Agriculture of North Dakota has been making a line of experiments during recent years of a technical, scientific kind to determine what these grades ought to be. For that purpose they have an experimental flour mill and a chemical laboratory and a baking laboratory. Having been instrumental in securing this equipment for our college while a member of the North Dakota Legislature I have studied the bulletins of

Dr. Ladd with great interest and diligence. The result of last year's investigations is particularly important and reveals a situation that calls loudly for a scientific method of establishing grain standards.

There was a spread last year in the values of grain sold under different standards between the highest grade and the lowest grade of 97 cents. To describe the crop of last year—that is, the 1916 crop—nine different grades were defined by the grain dealers. Now the investigations conducted at Fargo show that these definitions, these grades that have been used, are arbitrary and have not been made according to the milling value of the wheat for the greater portion of the crop last year. I will say that in a general way the crop last year was not a good-looking crop. In appearance it was shrunken and the wheat was not up to normal.

Now, with those superficial methods that they have had in the past of establishing these standards, not going beyond the weight and the physical appearance, they branded a whole lot of this wheat as simply "feed." The grain men have been using grades that they call "A feed," "B feed," "C feed," and "D feed." Now, that indicates, if it indicates anything, that those who are doing the grading of this grain concluded that it was not wheat at all; it was not entitled to be known as wheat; it was simply feed—chicken feed.

Dr. Ladd, at Fargo, took 43 different samples of "D feed" grade, and the results of the investigation show this, that in point of absorption—that is something that is always looked to by the bakers in buying flour, because they want a flour that is capable of large absorption, and I am talking now of "D feed," the lowest grade of feed—41 samples were superior to No. 1 northern, and only two of the samples fell less than No. 1 northern, and they were only 1 per cent below.

Now, as to the volume of the bread made from this "D feed," the bakers always like a large-looking loaf. No matter what it weighs, they like a large-looking loaf. Thirty-nine samples were superior to No. 1 northern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that he may proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Reserving the right to object, can not the gentleman get along with five minutes. Let me say to him that there is a very important bill that gentlemen who have charge of it desire to put through this afternoon, if possible, and I am trying to hurry the consideration of this bill to accommodate them.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I have never retarded the progress of this bill by saying a single word during its consideration.

Mr. STEENERSON. I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will allow this extension. It is very important.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that his time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am talking now of the different points which go to indicate whether flour is valuable or whether it is not, or whether it belongs to a low grade or not. We are dealing here only with experiments made with D-feed wheat. As to the volume of the loaf, 39 samples were better than No. 1 northern and only 4 of them fell below.

Now as to the color, that is also an important item with the bakers and with every housewife. I do not know but it is more important to the housewife than it is with the bakers. The housewife wants a white-looking loaf. Eighty-eight per cent has always been regarded by bakers and experts who pass on this question as sufficient. It ought not to fall below 88 per cent. If it is 88 per cent or better, it is all right on the color question. Twenty-six samples of flour made from D-feed were above 88 per cent in point of color and 17 samples were below 88. Taking all the feed samples together and averaging them, we get 88.5. It is the most common thing in the world, in the flour trade and in the milling trade, to blend wheat. Soft wheat is blended with hard wheat, and high quality hard wheat is blended with a low quality; so that if any of these D-feed wheats did fall below 88 per cent, all that was necessary was to blend them with wheat of higher grade, to take care of the item of color. As I have shown, all the feed grades, A, B, C, and D, gave an average of 88.5 per cent, and by blending them with the grades above that the percentage of color would be raised still higher.

Texture is another point on which they judge flour and bread. All of the 43 samples of 4 feed were better than No. 1

northern. I want to call your attention especially to that. In point of texture every single one of the 43 samples of D feed examined at the North Dakota Agricultural College tested higher than bread made from No. 1 northern.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I am very much interested. Do I understand that the market buyers, wanting to undergrade certain kinds of wheat, had branded it as A, B, C, and D feed, not designating it as wheat at all, but as feed?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. They said that in purchasing wheat in North Dakota there should be these grades: No. 1 northern, No. 2 northern, No. 3 northern, No. 4 northern, A feed, B feed, C feed, and D feed.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. And actual experience has shown that bread made from D-feed wheat is equal to No. 1 northern.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. It is equal in point of absorption, protein content, and volume of loaf. In color it does not equal it, because No. 1 northern will average higher than 88 per cent; but, as I explained to the gentleman, the millers blend their wheats.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I understand. I just wanted to get it clear.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The average of all the D-feed flours was equal to 88.5 per cent in color, so that in order to reach the standard it would not be necessary to blend them with higher grades, but if they wanted a still higher percentage on color, they could be blended with so-called higher grades.

Now, as to the per cent of gross increase per bushel, according to the way this wheat was purchased in North Dakota and the Northwest last year, the best sample of No. 1 northern gave a gain of 22.2 cents. None of the 41 samples of D feed fell below 100 per cent gain.

Mr. STEENERSON. Gain of what?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The gentleman understands, of course, that there is a difference between profits and increased selling price. I am talking now about the sale of products and what the gain was on a bushel of this wheat, not the profit. That could not be determined without considering a number of other items. On No. 1 northern the gross products sold at prices, according to the Northwestern Miller, which represented a gain of 22 per cent. On D feed the gain was over 100 per cent.

Mr. STEENERSON. Over what?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Over the purchase price.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Does the gentleman mean the gain over last year's level?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No; taking the wheat of 1916, the entire products from No. 1 northern wheat sold for 22 per cent more than the purchase price, according to the Minneapolis market, for wheat, flour, shorts, bran, and the different products. The percentage of increase on the products from D-feed wheat was over 100 per cent.

Mr. KELLEY. Does the gentleman mean over and above what the farmer received for the crop?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. When were these tests made?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. During the months of October and November.

Mr. STEENERSON. In 1916?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In 1916. Now, as to the gross receipts per bushel, including screenings, during the past season, for No. 1 northern wheat they got \$2.12.

Mr. MADDEN. Who got \$2.12?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Those who sold the products. It is pretty hard to tell just where the profit goes, but in our country the belief is general that the grain dealers are the chief offenders and the chief beneficiaries.

Mr. MADDEN. It was not the farmer?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. No. For the poorest sample of D-feed out of the 43 samples the products brought \$1.85. The average for the products of all the feed samples was \$1.994. The best, from No. 1 northern, was \$2.084, so there was only a spread of 9 cents in the total products sold between No. 1 northern and D feed.

Mr. MADDEN. A spread of only 9 cents in the difference of the price to the miller.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. In the difference of the price got by the miller when he sold all these products.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the spread above the price received by the farmer?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I can give you a pretty fair idea of it. Here is an estimate made by Dr. Ladd on a carload of wheat sold at Fargo, N. Dak., a sample of D feed. The carload was bought from the farmer for \$653.01. It was sold

for an advance over and above that of \$1,031.72. You understand this is an estimate made by Dr. Ladd.

Mr. STAFFORD. In what period of time was there that increase?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. President Ladd took the sole price of the products and the purchase price of the wheat on the same day. He took the markets from the Northwestern Miller, of Minneapolis, Minn. Dr. Ladd is a noted chemist, who has won the entire confidence of North Dakota people because of his skillful, vigorous, and courageous enforcement of our pure-food law and because of his painstaking and thorough examination of many samples of North Dakota wheat, the results of which have been published in bulletins from year to year. I shall ask presently to quote quite freely from his last bulletin, which will reply more fully to the different questions my colleagues have been asking me. Being limited very much in time it has not been possible for me to cover each item with thoroughness, and those specially interested in this subject should read Dr. Ladd's bulletin in full.

Mr. STEENERSON. As I understand, D feed weighs only about 40 pounds to the bushel, but when you sell it you sell 60 pounds.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Certainly.

Mr. STEENERSON. If you sell it by the bushel you have to give 60 pounds in weight?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes; and that is where some superficial people fall down in an investigation of this question. While in fixing the grade it is said a certain grade shall weigh so many pounds, that is only to fix the grade; but when you load it into the elevator it takes 60 pounds to make a bushel. It has been found that 60 pounds of one grade of wheat and 60 of another is worth very much the same. There is no justice in multiplying arbitrary grades; that is only an excuse for pounding down the price of the low grades.

In 1873 they only had two grades. Five years later they pushed it up to three. In 1907 they had five grades, and then finding that the farmers were easy and standing for it they increased it to seven grades. When the price is fixed on No. 1 northern and a number of arbitrary grades are fixed below it it becomes possible to establish a different price for each grade, and the more grades there are the lower the price can be depressed for the so-called lower grades. Last year the grain men got the number of grades increased up to nine.

Mr. MADDEN. What was the difference between the highest grade and the lowest grade?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Ninety-seven cents. Now, the proposition that I want to drive home is that either the work of Dr. Ladd, at Fargo, is right or it is not. I claim that his standards should be followed or the officials of the Department of Agriculture should install an experimental mill and laboratories here and do the work themselves. I claim that the farmers are entitled to have the Department of Agriculture follow the scientific tests made by Dr. Ladd for several years past, or else the Secretary of Agriculture ought to institute his own experimental mill and demonstrate whether this work is correct or not. [Applause.] He should not close his eyes to scientific truth. He should not follow the old, discredited, and unscientific method of relying solely upon the sense of sight and the sense of feeling. And I do not think he will do so if he can be brought to understand how vitally it affects not only the producers but also the consumers of the country.

I ask leave to print the bulletin issued by Dr. Ladd, No. 119, issued November, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter is as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA WHEAT FOR 1916.

[By Dr. E. F. Ladd, president North Dakota Agricultural College.]

Two bulletins have been published containing information with regard to wheat matters, namely, Special Bulletin No. 14, volume 3, "Is the Present System of Grading Wheat Equitable?" and Bulletin No. 114, "Chemical and Physical Constants for Wheat and Mill Products," which have brought repeated demands for information with regard to the milling and bread-producing qualities of the wheat crop for 1916. It is decided, therefore, to publish the data for the 1916 samples thus far milled, giving more detailed and complete information on the completion of the year's experiments, which can not be finished before mid-summer. The writer is responsible for the presentation of the matter, while all of the milling and grading results are furnished by Thomas Sanderson, and the analytical and baking results by Levi Thomas and W. L. Stockham.

Wheats at the terminal markets of Minnesota are graded in accordance with the Minnesota grades as prepared by the board of grain appeals at Minneapolis and the board of grain appeals at Duluth. From an official publication we quote the following for northern spring wheat, also for durum wheat:

"NORTHERN SPRING WHEAT.

"No. 1 hard spring wheat: Shall be dry, sound, bright, sweet, clean, and consist of over 75 per cent of the hard kernels and weigh not less than 58 pounds to the measured bushel.

"No. 1 northern spring wheat: Shall be dry, sound, sweet, and clean; may consist of the hard and soft kernels of spring wheat and weigh not less than 57 pounds to the measured bushel, and shall not contain to exceed one-half of 1 per cent of wild vetch (wild pease) or kingheads, singly or combined, and not to exceed a total of 1 per cent of inseparable weed seed.

"No. 2 northern spring wheat: Shall be dry spring wheat, not clean enough or sound enough for No. 1, but of good milling quality, and must weigh not less than 56 pounds to the measured bushel, and shall not contain to exceed 1 per cent of wild vetch (wild pease) or kingheads, singly or combined, and not to exceed a total of 2 per cent of inseparable weed seed.

"No. 3 northern spring wheat: Shall be composed of inferior, shrunken spring wheat and weigh not less than 54 pounds to the measured bushel, and shall not contain to exceed 2 per cent of wild vetch (wild pease) or kingheads, singly or combined, and not to exceed a total of 4 per cent of inseparable weed seed.

"No. 4 northern spring wheat: Shall include inferior spring wheat that is badly shrunken or damaged, and weigh not less than 49 pounds to the measured bushel.

"Sample grade spring wheat: Shall include all varieties of inferior spring wheat that is badly sprouted, very musty, badly bin burnt, fire burned, badly damaged, containing live weevil, or otherwise unfit for higher grades.

"No-grade wheat: All spring and durum wheat containing 15 per cent or more of moisture, or in a heating condition or otherwise unfit for store, shall be classed no grade, with inspector's notation as to what grade same would be if in condition. For example: NG No. 1, NG No. 2, NG No. 3, etc.

"NOTE.—Hard, flinty wheat of good milling quality and containing no appreciable admixture of soft wheat may be admitted into the grades of No. 2 northern spring wheat, No. 3 northern spring wheat, and No. 4 northern spring wheat, provided weight of the same is not more than 1 pound less than the minimum test weight required by the existing rules of said grades, and provided, further, that such wheat is in all other respects qualified for admission into such grades.

"NOTE.—The variety of wheat known as 'humpback' owing to its inferior milling quality, shall not be graded higher than No. 3.

"NOTE.—The percentage of inseparable weed seed, as stated above, shall be carried only when the wheat is of sufficiently superior quality to justify these additional defects.

"DURUM (MACARONI) WHEAT.

"No. 1 durum wheat: Shall be bright, sound, dry, well cleaned, and be composed of durum, commonly known as macaroni wheat, and weigh not less than 60 pounds to the measured bushel.

"No. 2 durum wheat: Shall be dry, clean, and of good milling quality. It shall include all durum wheat that for any reason is not suitable for No. 1 durum and weigh not less than 58 pounds to the measured bushel.

"No. 3 durum wheat: Shall include all durum wheat bleached, shrunken, or for any reason unfit for No. 2 and weigh not less than 55 pounds to the measured bushel.

"No. 4 durum wheat: Shall include all durum wheat that is badly bleached or for any cause unfit for No. 3.

"NOTE.—Red-berried durum, western soft durum, owing to their inferior milling quality, shall not be graded higher than No. 3.

"NOTE.—The percentages of inseparable weed seed established for Nos. 1, 2 and 3 northern spring wheat shall also apply to Nos. 1, 2, and 3, durum wheat.

"Mixed wheat: Eight per cent or more of spring wheat in durum, winter or western white or red wheat and 4 per cent or more of durum, winter, or western white or red wheat in spring wheat shall be graded Nos. 1, 2, 3, etc., mixed wheat."

It will thus be observed that only five grades are fixed for the wheats and in addition "sample grade" and "no grade," "no grade," of course, representing wheat in bad condition. The sales, therefore, in the terminal market in Minneapolis, for example, are assumed to be made on these grades, but it would appear that the grading of the wheat, as carried out at the point of purchase in North Dakota, is in accordance with instructions sent out from day to day from Minneapolis, as shown by the following from a notification postal card sent out regularly to the buyers of wheat.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., October 14, 1916.

[This cancels card of 13.]

	Pounds.	Quota-
		tions.
Wheat No. 1 northern.....	57	158
Wheat No. 2 northern.....	56	154
Wheat No. 3 northern.....	54	148
Wheat No. 4 northern.....	53	136
Do.....	52	130
Winter wheat No. 2.....		144
Winter wheat No. 3.....		138
Durum No. 1.....	60	160
Durum No. 2.....	58	156
Durum No. 3.....	55	144
Durum No. 4.....	54	127
Do.....	52-53	115
Sample feed spring No. 4.....	49-51	124
Sample feed spring A.....	47-48	114
Sample feed spring B.....	45-46	99
Sample feed spring C.....	43-44	89
Sample feed spring D.....	35-42	79
Feed durum No. 4.....	50-51	102
Feed durum A.....	48-49	93
Feed durum B.....	46-47	83
Feed durum C.....	44-45	73
Feed durum D.....	40-43	63

Nor. 36. The Grain Bulletin.

The official body establishing these grades and prices is not given on the cards as they go out from Minneapolis to the dealer. It will be noticed that the grading according to this card is quite different from the official grades and does not conform with regard to test weight per bushel.

There are several additional grades—grade 4, No. 2, and grade 4, No. 3; and in addition to these a classification is made as "Feed A," "B," "C," and "D."

No matter what the grade may be at the point of purchase the terminal grade is assumed to be one of the five as indicated in the official announcement from the board of grain appeals. Therefore, No. 4—No. 2, and No. 4—No. 3 and a part of feed A should sell as No. 4. The balance of feed A, as well as feeds B, C, and D, will all be sold as sample grade if sold under the official classification.

It may be also assumed that the term "feed" is intended to imply that the wheat had no milling value, but is to be used exclusively for feed purposes. The milling tests, together with the baking test, will therefore prove of special interest in this connection. The milling was done on the small two-stand mill. The samples were sent in from various parts of the State, some from individual farmers, from county agricultural agents, elevators, demonstration farms, etc. The number of samples in the higher grades are rather limited, but having no choice in the matter we have used them as received.

As already indicated the grading is based on a card or price list sent out to the local elevators by the Grain Bulletin from Minneapolis, and is the elevator's instructions regarding grade and price until there is received a renewal with the market changes. This card is more stringent regarding the higher grades than the grading rules issued by the Minnesota grain inspection department since there are grades which the rules make no provision for at all. Therefore the wheat would appear to be bought from the farmer by one set of rules or system of grading and sold to the terminal elevator by an entirely different system of grading if we are to judge from the information available to us. The price as quoted on the card is made apparently on the test weight per measured bushel but requires 60 pounds of wheat in each case to constitute a bushel as sold. In our comparison as a basis for the market value, we take the average of the high and low cash market at Minneapolis, as quoted by the Northwestern Miller for six days, October 11-17, inclusive. Using this average price as far down as the grades apply or correspond to the grades as shown by the card, and then using the same spread in price between No. 1, as is shown by the card, we get the market price for all the other grades as follows:

MARKET PRICE.

Average of high and low and averages for October 11-17, inclusive. From page 173, Northwestern Miller.

Grade.	Hard red spring.	Durum.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.732	\$1.806
No. 2 northern.....	1.704	1.760
No. 3 northern.....	1.626	1.6112
No. 4 northern.....	1.403	(1)
Sample grade.....	1.2777	(1)
No grade.....	1.4139	(1)

¹ Not quoted.

If we base our values on No. 1 northern, with the same spread in value as shown on the card sent to the local elevators by the Grain Bulletin, then we have the following:

Grade.	Hard red spring.	Durum.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.732	\$1.806
No. 2 northern.....	1.704	1.760
No. 3 northern.....	1.626	1.6112
No. 4 northern.....	1.51	1.47
Do.....	1.45	1.35
Do.....	1.39	1.22
A feed.....	1.29	1.13
B feed.....	1.14	1.03
C feed.....	1.04	.93
D feed.....	.94	.83

If we deduct from the above figures the freight rate per bushel for any grade to the Minnesota transfer, we should then have the local value of the wheat or from Fargo approximately 7 cents per bushel.

The market quotations for flour during the same period, according to the Northwestern Miller, ending October 17, 1916, were as follows:

Straight flour, per 100 pounds.....	\$4.426
Bran, per 100 pounds.....	1.156
Shorts and other products, per 100 pounds.....	1.567
Screenings, per 100 pounds.....	.675

The foregoing prices are for wholesale or carload lots and based upon the market price at Minneapolis. The above values are used throughout in the calculations for these tables.

It will be observed that the majority of the samples for this year are falling under the classification of "feed" grades, and there is in our series no No. 4 northern, although there are a few samples of the higher grades. The large proportion of the lower grades of wheat makes the grading of the milling value of the wheat an important matter this year.

The tables from 1 to 9 show clearly for themselves the facts concerning the several grades examined.

WHAT THE DATA SHOW.

A study of the tables will show, from a milling point of view, that the per cent of flour from No. 1 and No. 2 northern is fairly high and compares favorably with the results obtained at this station in other years, although the number of samples represented are limited and might run, in a larger series, somewhat different. The samples in No. 3 and No. 4 northern grades are a little low in per cent of flour compared with the same grades in other years; while in the so-called "feed" grades we have had very few samples in other years with which to make a comparison.

We find in the No. 3 and No. 4 northern grades a test weight, before cleaning, of 55 pounds to 49 pounds, and we have the per cent of flour ranging from 69.03 to 63.01, with the lowest average of any grade 65.18 per cent; in the feed grades a range from 67.78 to 50.23 per cent, with the lowest average in any grade 60.40 per cent. Between the

maximums of all grades there is a spread in per cent of flour from 73.07 in Table II, sample 2990, to 50.32 in Table IX, sample 3289. If we assume that the flour from these two samples is of equal baking quality (the baking results show they are), then the flour should be of equal value; and figuring the difference in per cent of flour to be 22.75, at the value as shown of \$4.426, the difference would be \$1, or 60 cents per bushel. The sample giving the high per cent of flour, being No. 2 northern, the market value \$1.704, would make the sample giving the low per cent of flour worth \$1.104, or 16.4 cents more than the market value when based on the flour per cent alone. When we consider, for these two samples, the value of the mill products we find a difference of 33.72 cents, which would give a market value per bushel of \$1.374, or 43.4 cents per bushel more than the market value when compared with the No. 2 sample. Ignoring the dockage in either case, there would be a difference in value of 48.78 cents per bushel, or for No. 2 northern, value \$1.704 less 48.78 cents, equals \$1.262, or 32.62 cents per bushel more than market value.

BAKING RESULTS.

A study of the data presented in the baking results will show that these samples can be blended together in almost any quantity and the

flour would make a good bread. By eliminating some of the poor samples or by adding more of the good samples a choice flour could be produced. As a matter of fact, the large mills all blend wheats to get the desired results for color, texture, and loaf volume. All these wheats are good, and in general show large loaf volume and good texture, but not always standard in color, sometimes quite inferior in color, which would not seriously affect the blend and would add much in strength, for the gluten content is exceptionally good.

GENERAL AVERAGES.

If we take the general averages for the several grades as presented in the tables and bring together the data for comparison, both with regard to the milling and baking tests, we shall find that the per cent of flour is much higher for the lower grades than is generally assumed. If we examine the loaf volume, we note that for the lower grades the volume is much higher than for the higher grades, while the color averages the equal of the minimum standard for straight flours. The same is true for the texture, although it does not equal that of the higher grades, and shows the advantages that would come from being blended with other flours. The data for the combined averages is as follows:

TABLE XV.—The averages.

Receipts.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4 (2).	No. 4 (3).	Feed.			
						A.	B.	C.	D.
Weight uncleaned.....	57.5	56.0	54.4	52.1	49.2	47.4	45.0	43.3	37.9
Weight cleaned.....	60.5	58.5	58.7	56.1	54.2	53.4	50.8	49.6	46.7
Screenings.....	3.37	3.96	6.23	6.57	6.77	9.24	11.51	8.43	17.34
Flour, per cent.....	69.63	72.64	65.44	65.18	65.68	63.72	63.39	62.9	60.40
Bran, per cent.....	16.27	14.30	12.57	12.90	15.88	15.98	17.76	17.35	19.04
Shorts, per cent.....	13.53	13.69	20.76	21.44	18.41	20.41	19.04	19.11	19.69
Loaf, volume, cubic centimeters.....	2,317	2,292	2,291	2,304	2,522	2,314	2,471	2,734	2,677
Color.....	93.7	93.2	91.5	91.0	91.0	88.6	88.9	92.3	84.3
Texture.....	93.0	94.2	90.5	90.2	89.2	88.3	89.0	93.6	91.5

In the same manner, if we bring together the receipts for the mill products as compared with the cost for the wheats, we shall get a better

idea of the relative value and of the gain in per cent, or, undoubtedly, the comparative profits for handling the several grades of wheat, as follows:

TABLE XVI.—The receipts per bushel.

Receipts.	No. 1.	No. 2.	No. 3.	No. 4 (2).	No. 4 (3).	Feed.			
						A.	B.	C.	D.
The cost.....	\$1.732	\$1.704	\$1.626	\$1.45	\$1.39	\$1.29	\$1.14	\$1.04	\$0.94
Screenings.....	.0136	.0160	.0252	.0266	.0274	.0374	.0466	.0359	.0702
Flour.....	1.8494	1.9290	1.7378	1.7309	1.7442	1.692	1.6834	1.6996	1.6040
Bran.....	.1129	.0992	.0872	.0895	.1101	.1108	.1232	.1203	.1321
Shorts.....	.1272	.1287	.1932	.2016	.1731	.1919	.1790	.1797	.1851
Total.....	2.1031	2.1729	2.0454	2.0486	2.0548	2.0323	2.0322	2.0055	1.9914
Increase.....	.3711	.4689	.4194	.5986	.6648	.7423	.8922	.9655	1.0514
Gain, per cent.....	21.4	27.5	25.8	41.1	47.8	57.5	78.2	92.8	111.9

RELATIVE PROFITS.

In examining the table above we note that the per cent of flour produced by the grades of wheat Nos. 3, 4 (2), and 4 (3) are essentially the same, or above 65 per cent, and therefore, presumably, are of equal value for flour production, while in bread production they show a larger loaf volume than the higher grades and are but slightly inferior in color. Four classes of wheats graded as feed A, B, C, and D all produce above 60 per cent of flour on the average for the entire series, and it is not to be assumed that a product of as much value as this for flour production will be used as cattle feed. When we examine the bread made from these flours we find a better average loaf volume than for any other class, as would be expected from the gluten content, and the color and texture averages well. The interesting feature comes, however, it seems to me, in considering the increase in per cent of the sales price for the mill products as compared with the cost for the wheat. This can best be summarized again as follows:

TABLE XVII.—Comparison of cost of wheat and receipts from mill products.

	Cost of wheat.	Receipts from mill products.	Per cent of gain.
No. 1 northern.....	\$1.732	\$2.1031	21.4
No. 2 northern.....	1.704	2.1729	27.5
No. 3 northern.....	1.626	2.0454	25.8
No. 4 (2).....	1.45	2.0486	41.1
No. 4 (3).....	1.39	2.0548	47.8
Feed A.....	1.29	2.0323	57.5
Feed B.....	1.14	2.0322	78.2
Feed C.....	1.04	2.0055	92.8
Feed D.....	.94	1.9914	111.9

Clearly, if there is a profit in milling high-grade wheats, No. 1 and No. 2 Northern this year, when the gain is 21.4 per cent and 27.5 per cent, then certainly in the lower grades, where for No. 4 (3) there is a gain of 47.8 per cent and in Feed C 92.8 per cent and in Feed D 111.9 per cent, then there certainly should be a net profit for the feed wheats much in excess of that made on the high-grade wheats, and would indicate their relatively greater value than is shown by the purchase price. These figures, of course, do not show the cost of manufacture or legitimate profits; they are only intended to be accurate data with regard to

the total proceeds from the sale of the various products as compared with the cost of the original material.

A CARLOAD OF WHEAT.

For convenience let us take a carload of wheat for the several grades and follow it through from the North Dakota farmer to the terminals and the milling portions back again through to retail trade to the consumer, who may have been the farmer who produced the wheat itself. This will give us a better means of comparison and one that can be easily understood and followed.

Nine of the 10 grades are represented in the tables presented in this bulletin. There were no samples with the proper weight per measured bushel to make a first No. 4 Northern grade. It should be borne in mind that these grades do not conform to the Minnesota grain-inspection rules, which provide for seven grades for Hard Red Spring wheat. The grades as shown on the card, therefore, are arbitrary and only apply when the farmer sells his wheat to the local elevator company or other dealer employing this same system of grading. For a comparison of the grades and values we will offer the following, giving the local grade and weight per bushel and value as shown by the card of October 14, 1916, followed by the grain-inspection department grades, weight per bushel, and average value at Minneapolis for the week ending October 17, 1916.

TABLE XVIII.—Comparison of local grades and values with grade and value at Minneapolis.

Local grade.	Weight per bushel.	Value.
No. 1 northern.....	57	\$1.58
No. 2 northern.....	56	1.54
No. 3 northern.....	54	1.48
No. 4 northern.....	53	1.36
Do.....	52	1.30
Do.....	49-51	1.24
A feed.....	47-48	1.14
B feed.....	45-46	.99
C feed.....	43-44	.89
D feed.....	35-42	.79

TABLE XVIII.—Comparison of local grades and values with grade and value at Minneapolis—Continued.

Minneapolis grade.	Weight per bushel.	Value.
	Pounds.	
No. 1 northern	57	\$1.732
No. 2 northern	55	1.704
No. 3 northern	53	1.626
No. 4 northern	48	1.51
Sample grade	No limit.	1.28
No grade		1.41

Let us use 60,000 pounds as a carload and take the nine grades, assuming that the farmer sold the product at the values here given, and calculate the returns for the same; first, the wheat as received from the farmer; then the wheat as graded in Minneapolis on the track; then the amount received by the elevator company unloaded. If we then take the data furnished from the milling experiments and calculate the market value for the flour, bran, and shorts, or mill products, comparing these with the local feed and flour values for the same products as retailed in Fargo, we shall have pretty complete information.

TABLE XIX.—No. 1 northern: Carload (60,000 pounds) bought from farmer Oct. 14, at card value, \$1.58 per bushel.

	Grade No.—			
	1°.	2°.	3°.	4° (2).
Dockage, per cent.	3.37	3.96	6.23	6.57
Clean wheat, bushels-pounds	996-18	960-24	937-42	934-18
Price, per bushel	\$1.58	\$1.54	\$1.48	\$1.30
Value	\$1,526.75	\$1,479.01	\$1,387.73	\$1,214.43

If we ship the same wheat to Minneapolis, according to the prices, we should have the following:

TABLE XX.—Minneapolis value of wheat cited in Table XIX.

	Grade No.—			
	1°.	2°.	3°.	4° (2).
Dockage, bushels-pounds	33-42	39-36	39-36	65-42
Clean wheat, bushels-pounds	996-18	960-24	937-42	934-18
Price, per bushel	\$1.732	\$1.704	\$1.625	\$1.45
Value	\$1,673.34	\$1,636.35	\$1,507.30	\$1,354.56
Less freight at 11 cents per hundred weight	\$66.00	\$66.00	\$66.00	\$66.00
Net value on track at Minneapolis	\$1,607.34	\$1,570.35	\$1,441.30	\$1,288.56
Gain	\$80.59	\$91.34	\$53.57	\$74.13
Value of screenings	\$13.65	\$18.63	\$25.23	\$26.21
Total gain	\$94.24	\$109.97	\$78.80	\$100.34

From the above total gain the farmer would find it necessary to pay his commission and losses.

On the other hand, let us assume that the wheat has gone into the mill, been converted into mill products, and sold at Minneapolis wholesale prices, as follows:

TABLE XXI.—Wholesale price of mill products of wheat cited in Table XIX.

	Grade No. 1°.	Grade No. 2°.	Grade No. 3°.	Grade No. 4° (2).
Screenings, pounds	2,022	2,376	3,738	3,942
Screenings, value	\$13.65	\$18.63	\$25.23	\$26.21
Straight flour, value	\$1,788.66	\$1,854.31	\$1,631.04	\$1,618.68
Bran, value	\$109.42	\$95.58	\$82.04	\$83.88
Shorts, value	\$123.15	\$123.86	\$183.37	\$188.68
Total receipts	\$2,034.88	\$2,092.38	\$1,921.68	\$1,917.85
Cost of wheat on track	\$1,673.34	\$1,636.35	\$1,507.30	\$1,354.56
Gross gain	\$361.54	\$456.03	\$414.38	\$563.29

Now, let us assume that the same products have been returned to the retail trade at Fargo and sold at the prevailing prices:

TABLE XXII.—Retail price at Fargo of mill products of wheat cited in Table XIX.

	Grade No. 1°.	Grade No. 2°.	Grade No. 3°.	Grade No. 4° (2).
Screenings	\$22.24	\$26.14	\$41.12	\$43.36
Straight flour	2,244.91	2,327.30	2,047.08	2,031.57
Bran	146.21	127.72	109.62	112.08
Shorts	145.11	145.95	216.08	222.33
Total receipts	2,558.47	2,627.11	2,413.90	2,409.34
Total gain	1,031.72	1,137.10	1,026.17	1,194.91

In the same manner let us consider the several other grades.

TABLE XXIII.—No. 4 northern (3) (60,000 pounds) and the wheats marked "feed" A, B, C, and D bought from farmer Oct. 14 at card value, \$1.24 per bushel.

	Grade No. 4 (3).	Feed A.	Feed B.	Feed C.	Feed D.
Dockage, per cent.	6.77	9.24	11.51	8.43	17.34
Clean wheat, bushels-pounds	932-18	907-36	884-54	915-42	823-36
Price per bushel	\$1.24	\$1.14	\$0.99	\$0.89	\$0.79
Value	\$1,156.05	\$1,034.39	\$876.05	\$814.97	\$653.01

If we ship the same wheat to Minneapolis, according to prices on the track, we should have the following:

TABLE XXIV.—Minneapolis value of wheat cited in Table XXIII.

	Grade No. 4 (3).	Feed A.	Feed B.	Feed C.	Feed D.
Dockage, bushels-pounds	67-42	92-24	115-6	84-18	173-24
Clean wheat, bushels-pounds	932-18	907-36	884-54	915-42	823-36
Price per bushel	\$1.39	\$1.28	\$1.28	\$1.28	\$1.28
Value	\$1,295.73	\$1,161.72	\$1,132.65	\$1,172.09	\$1,058.05
Less freight at 11 cents per hundred weight	\$66.00	\$66.00	\$66.00	\$66.00	\$66.00
Net value on track at Minneapolis	\$1,229.73	\$1,095.72	\$1,066.65	\$1,106.09	\$992.05
Gain	\$73.68	\$71.33	\$100.60	\$291.12	\$339.04
Value of screenings	\$27.42	\$37.42	\$46.62	\$34.14	\$70.23
Total gain	\$101.10	\$108.75	\$237.22	\$325.26	\$409.27

On the other hand, as in previous cases, let us assume that the wheat has gone into the mill, been converted into mill products, and sold at wholesale prices, as follows:

TABLE XXV.—Wholesale price of mill products of wheat cited in Table XXIII.

	Grade No. 4 (3).	Feed A.	Feed B.	Feed C.	Feed D.
Screenings, pounds	4,062	5,544	6,906	5,058	10,404
Value	\$27.42	\$37.42	\$46.62	\$34.14	\$70.23
Straight flour, value	\$1,627.58	\$1,537.17	\$1,490.96	\$1,530.21	\$1,327.05
Bran, value	\$103.04	\$100.94	\$109.39	\$110.57	\$109.54
Shorts, value	\$161.68	\$174.49	\$158.71	\$164.85	\$153.33
Total value	\$1,919.72	\$1,850.02	\$1,805.68	\$1,839.77	\$1,660.15
Cost of wheat on track at Minneapolis	\$1,295.73	\$1,161.72	\$1,066.65	\$1,106.09	\$1,058.05
Gross gain	\$693.99	\$688.30	\$739.03	\$733.68	\$602.10

As in the previous case, let us assume that the products have been returned to the retail trade at Fargo and sold at the prices prevailing, or had been purchased back by the farmer who grew the wheat, then for these respective grades we should have:

TABLE XXVI.—Retail price at Fargo of mill products of wheat cited in Table XXIII.

	Grade No. 4 (3).	Feed A.	Feed B.	Feed C.	Feed D.
Screenings	\$44.68	\$60.98	\$75.97	\$55.64	\$114.44
Flour	2,042.74	1,929.26	1,871.27	1,920.54	1,665.55
Bran	137.69	134.88	146.17	147.75	146.37
Shorts	190.51	205.61	187.02	194.25	180.67
Total receipts	2,415.62	2,330.73	2,280.43	2,318.18	2,107.03
Increased cost	1,259.57	1,205.34	1,404.38	1,493.21	1,454.02

SUMMARIZED STATEMENT.

Let us summarize more fully the data presented for the carload lots by taking the totals as received for the products at market value and show how much it has cost the farmer who brought in the carload of wheat at Fargo and purchased at market prices the mill products therefrom, as well as the intervening prices that prevailed at the terminal and as the wholesale prices for the mill products. The results will be as follows:

TABLE XXVII.—A carload of wheat from farmer to consumer.

Grade.	Price paid farmer.	Minneapolis price on track.	Mill products—	
			As whole-saled.	As retailed at Fargo.
No. 1 northern	\$1,526.75	\$1,607.34	\$2,034.88	\$2,558.47
No. 2 northern	1,479.01	1,570.35	2,002.38	2,627.11
No. 3 northern	1,387.73	1,441.30	1,921.68	2,413.90
No. 4 northern (2)	1,214.43	1,288.56	1,917.85	2,409.34
No. 4 northern (3)	1,156.05	1,229.73	1,919.72	2,415.62
A feed	1,034.39	1,195.72	1,850.02	2,330.73
B feed	876.05	1,066.65	1,805.68	2,288.43
C feed	814.97	1,106.09	1,839.77	2,318.18
D feed	653.01	992.05	1,660.15	2,107.03

In the above we have attempted only to follow through a concrete example of a carload of wheat so as to show more specifically what each grade would be valued at according to the system of grading and marketing prevailing in the several localities. In other words, then, the farmer who sold one carload of wheat, 60,000 pounds, at Fargo, and purchased back the mill products from the same, as returned from Minneapolis, pays for the transaction above the price which he received for his wheat for the several grades, as follows:

TABLE XXVIII.—Increased cost of mill products over price for wheat.

No. 1 northern	\$1,031.72
No. 2 northern	1,148.10
No. 3 northern	1,026.17
No. 4 northern (2)	1,195.41
No. 4 northern (3)	1,259.57
A feed	1,295.34
B feed	1,404.38
C feed	1,493.21
D feed	1,454.02

In other words, on an investment for low-grade wheat which costs, for a carload, less than one-half of that for a high-grade wheat, there was a total income very much greater than for the best wheat on the market. For example, in grade D feed, the carload cost \$653.01, as compared with \$1,526.75 for grade No. 1 northern; while the increase in selling price over that of the cost price for feed A wheat would be \$1,454.02 and only \$1,031.72 on the No. 1 northern. This would seem to lead back to the original question as given in our first bulletin, "Is the present system of grading wheat equitable?"

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the phraseology is slightly different from that carried in the bill of last year under the Bureau of Plant Industry, and I wish to ask if there is a different character of work intended to be performed.

Mr. LEVER. Under the language carried in the present act the Department of Agriculture fixes the standards of grain. Now, that work is being carried on under the grain-standard act, and therefore is not necessary in this item at this time. We changed it so that none of this appropriation can be used for fixing standards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then why is it necessary to increase the appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri who had charge of that matter.

Mr. RUBEY. Under the grain-standard act passed last August, and which becomes effective the 1st of next December, corn grades have been fixed and promulgated, and it is necessary as far as possible to prepare the grades of wheat and oats and other products, and the department wants to get them prepared and promulgated as soon as possible. It requires additional help and additional work, and that is the reason for the increased appropriation.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman states that the work carried in the appropriation of last year is going to be done under the grain-standards act?

Mr. RUBEY. The Secretary of Agriculture, under the law passed during the last session, is authorized to fix the standards, and this change of language has reference to fixing those standards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then we may look forward to a reduction in this item after the department gets fully equipped in fixing the various grades?

Mr. RUBEY. Yes; after they have established the grade of wheat and oats, which will be done soon, I look for a considerable reduction.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States cotton-futures act, including all expenses necessary for the purchase of equipment and supplies; for travel; for the employment of persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere; and for all other expenses, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, that may be necessary in executing the provisions of this act, \$98,600.

Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information from the chairman of the committee. I recall that another appropriation bill carries an item to enable the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to collect the tax on the sale of cotton futures, which is designed to prevent gambling in cotton futures. I want to ask the gentleman what connection there is between the work performed by the Internal Revenue Bureau and the Secretary of Agriculture. In other words, what does the Secretary of Agriculture have to do?

Mr. LEVER. Enforcement of the provisions of the cotton-futures act, except those provisions which relate to the matter of collecting the tax pure and simple, which, of course, must be done through the Treasury, is in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture. All the regulatory provisions fixing standards, settling disputes which may arise on contracts are taken care of by the Department of Agriculture. The Treasury Department has only to do with the matter of collecting the tax. The

fact is, the Treasury Department does not have a great deal to do, although it must have its agent there, so that if any taxable contracts are dealt in, the tax may be collected. I may say that the gentleman who represents the Treasury Department in New York is a most capable gentleman and is doing splendid work. I have followed his work very closely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain what became of the difficulty discussed last year about the New York court decision against the cotton-futures act?

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman will remember that in order to meet the court's decision to which he has referred, as far as possible, the cotton-futures act which had been held unconstitutional because it originated in the Senate rather than in the House, being a measure for taxation, was met by the reenactment of the cotton-futures act as a rider upon the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the question of holding over an estimate to defend the act no longer arises?

Mr. LEVER. No; I do not think the present act as it now stands has been questioned by anyone.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There is an actual use for the \$98,600?

Mr. LEVER. Undoubtedly.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States grain-standards act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States grain-standards act, including such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$519,140.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 77, line 20, after the figures, add:

"Provided, That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase and install an experimental flour mill and other apparatus and chemical and baking laboratories for the purpose of aiding him in establishing standards of quality and condition of wheat, barley, and other grains, as required by the act of Congress of August 11, 1916, known as the United States grain-standards act, and also for any purpose connected with the administration of said act."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the figures that I gave a few moments ago did not pass entirely without challenge. They were not directly challenged, so far as I know, by any of the grain dealers in Minneapolis or elsewhere; but what is known as the organ of the grain dealers in that section of the country, the Northwestern Miller, poked a little fun at Dr. Ladd. They called him a pseudoscientist, but they did not show where his figures were wrong. I find this, however, that one of the largest milling concerns in Minneapolis, corroborated the work of Dr. Ladd in a communication which it sent out to the trade throughout the United States. This is what they said, according to the nonpartisan Leader, published at Fargo, which succeeded in getting hold of an original copy of the letter which was sent out. It reads:

The quality of the 1916 crop as milled by us is excellent. There will be a marked increase in the loaf volume.

This corroborates Dr. Ladd's statement that all of the D-feed samples were larger in loaf volume, every single one of the 43 samples. The letter continues:

The gluten content will be from 11 to 12 per cent, which is considerably larger than the 1915 crop.

That also corroborates the statement I made a while ago. Gluten and protein are used interchangeably.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. Did not the agricultural experiment station at Fargo make some investigation as to the relative amount of gluten in the high-grade wheat and also the lower grades?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Yes. They found in the 1916 crop, the so-called low-grade wheats had more gluten than the high grades. That is corroborated by this big milling concern. Then they go on to say:

The time of fermentation will possibly be one-half hour longer than last crop. Owing to extremely warm weather during the ripening period, the wheat has already gone through the sweat and, consequently, the difficulties often experienced in handling new wheat flour will not be noticed to any extent.

That sweating process was because of the peculiar crop conditions that made the wheat look shrunken in appearance, and the shrunken appearance is what the Minnesota authorities graded the wheat on last year. I claim that is wrong; they

ought to ascertain the real milling value by milling, chemical, and baking tests. The letter goes on:

The indications are that the absorption will be about 2 per cent to 3 per cent higher than the previous crop.

I showed you a few moments ago that 41 out of the 43 samples made from D feed were higher in absorption than from No. 1 northern.

So, Mr. Chairman, we have the work of Dr. Ladd corroborated by one of the largest milling concerns in the United States.

If I could get the time, I would like to tell you about how farmers are hauling the so-called feed for many miles to a mill in the State of my friend from Minnesota [Mr. STEENESSON] and bring home good flour for it at a cost of 15 cents per bushel.

As to the cost of putting in apparatus to do this work, it cost only twenty-five hundred dollars to install the plant at Fargo. I was present with the officials—former President John H. Worst and E. F. Ladd, chemist—at the time the work was done, and I recall distinctly that that was the cost. Dr. Worst was greatly interested and prophesied much for it. I have a letter from the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., of Milwaukee, that made the plant at Fargo, and they say that the price is the same, that they will put one in at Washington for twenty-five hundred dollars. I think there should be a few other small items added to it that probably would make the cost about \$3,000.

The chairman has made a point of order against the amendment. I would not be surprised if the Secretary of Agriculture has authority now to install apparatus. In the grain-standards act passed last year it was provided that \$250,000 would be available for the expenses of carrying into effect the provisions of the act, and the explanation in the committee report of this particular item in the bill before us reads in this way:

Grain-standardization investigations (p. 76, line 24): This item has been transferred from the Bureau of Plant Industry. The language has been amended so as to eliminate the authority to fix standards. There is an apparent increase in the item of \$17,820, but as \$3,060 has been transferred to the statutory roll, there is an actual increase of \$20,880. This sum will be used to facilitate the investigations looking to the determination of the standards required under the grain-standards act.

It seems to me as though the Secretary, if the point of order made against my amendment is sustained, has authority now under the appropriation made at the last session and the appropriation now being made to include any necessary apparatus in the shape of an experimental mill at a cost of \$3,000 or so.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I regret to have to make the point of order. I make the point of order that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. Is it the opinion of the chairman of the committee that the Secretary of Agriculture now has authority to use the appropriations made at the last session or the one being made now to buy the necessary apparatus to make these tests?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that the Secretary of Agriculture has the authority to establish a laboratory for baking purposes or a flouring mill.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am directing my question now to purely experimental purposes, to ascertain the milling value of wheat grown in the United States.

Mr. LEVER. I am very candid with the gentleman. I think his amendment goes far beyond the purview of the law.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Is it not the purpose of the grain-standards act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to fix standards of quality?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Grades for grain sold in the United States.

Mr. LEVER. That is one of its purposes, of course.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. If you do not pass this amendment, or if a narrow interpretation is given to existing law, the Secretary of Agriculture will be confined only to what he can weigh on scales, see with his eyes, and feel with his hands.

Mr. LEVER. Of course, if the Secretary of Agriculture feels that he must have a flour mill and a bakery and all these things in order that he may establish standards; he will come to the committee and make that report, but until he does that the committee would feel that it ought not to allow this to go through.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am asking the chairman now whether, if this is voted down, the Secretary will not still have under existing law permission to go ahead?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so.

Mr. MOSS. I would like to ask the chairman if there is any more need for the establishment of a flour mill and a bakery in order to establish standards for wheat than for corn or any other product?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so. That is a matter of judgment. I do not think the grain-standards act authorizes him to go so far in machinery as to establish a flour mill or a bakery.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am not asking for a commercial flour mill, but a small mill to grind samples of wheat. The farmers were assured last year that the grain-standards act would bring them relief from crooked State-grain inspection systems. If the Secretary of Agriculture has not the authority now or is not given authority to proceed along scientific lines, the farmers in their marketing of grain will be simply jumping from the frying pan into the fire.

Mr. LEVER. That is a matter we will consider. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina as to the number of persons employed by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States grain-standards act. That act as written originally—

Mr. LEVER. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania direct his inquiries to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEN], who is the author of this legislation and in charge of this matter?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I shall be very glad to do it. I call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that \$519,240 is provided, half a million dollars, to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such persons and means as he may deem necessary to carry out the grain-standards act.

Mr. RUBEN. The Secretary of Agriculture in his estimates figures that he will need something like 218 men to put this act into force.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are they all specialists?

Mr. RUBEN. Some of them; a great many of them will be specialists.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will they come in under the civil service?

Mr. RUBEN. They are all under civil service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have their salaries been fixed?

Mr. RUBEN. The salaries have been fixed in a way. They run from \$1,200 up to, in one case, \$3,500; but so far only one man has been employed at a salary of \$3,500. The higher salaries will average about \$3,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The average will be \$3,000?

Mr. RUBEN. I say, the high-grade salaries will be about \$3,000. There are three men now employed at \$3,000 or a little above.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary has recently issued Bulletin No. 17, "service and regulatory announcements relative to United States grain-standards act," in which he gives the names and addresses and the districts of persons recently licensed to act as inspectors of grain. How are those persons paid?

Mr. RUBEN. Those persons are paid in this way: Where they are employed under the State they are paid by the State. Where they are employed under boards of trade or chambers of commerce they are paid by those organizations. They are not paid by the United States Government.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They are not paid by the Government?

Mr. RUBEN. No.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. At least 250 of these men are already licensed?

Mr. RUBEN. There are about 300 licensed.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. About 300 altogether. What about the supervisors?

Mr. RUBEN. There are about 39 trade centers where eventually one or more supervisors will be located. Up to the present there are 32 places where supervisors will be placed. For convenience in supervision the country has been divided into eight districts, and in each of these eight districts a very high-grade supervisor will be placed, who will have general supervision over the inspection in his district. Of the 32 places in the United States at which there will be supervisors there are 3 places—Chicago, Minneapolis, and Kansas City—where there will be as many as two assistant supervisors, and there are 15 places where there will be one assistant supervisor. Now, as I said before, there will be a general supervisor in each one of these eight districts who will supervise all the inspections in those districts.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. To be worked up in pyramid form, as it were. What will be the salary of the general supervisors, those at the top?

Mr. RUBEN. From \$3,000 to \$3,500.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. These are not fixed by law but by the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. RUBEEY. By the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The other supervisors in the 32 stations will receive what salaries?

Mr. RUBEEY. Their salaries are fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and they will be in the neighborhood of from \$2,000 to \$3,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman whether the major portion of this \$519,140 will go for salaries?

Mr. RUBEEY. For salaries and traveling expenses and rents and things of that sort. I will say this to the gentleman, that the work of these supervisors is done in the large cities and offices in large cities cost quite a good deal of money, and the expense item in maintaining offices where these supervisors will do their work is necessarily high.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. They are all new places?

Mr. RUBEEY. They are all new places. In one or two cities they have been able to get rooms in a Government building, and in cases of that kind there will be no rent to pay.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Have any of these supervisors generally, or in the 32 places, come from boards of trade or exchanges?

Mr. RUBEEY. They have come from boards of trade and from State departments, and by the appointment of men who have been in the grain business for many, many years.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As a matter of fact, in taking over this new branch of Government service, we have also taken over a number of employees of fixed institutions?

Mr. RUBEEY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the Government will now pay their salaries? That is the fact?

Mr. RUBEEY. They will pay the salaries of the supervisors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The Clerk will read.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. ALEXANDER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10384) entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States."

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administration of the United States warehouse act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States warehouse act, including the payment of such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$59,620.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask a few questions as to persons and means to be employed by the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out the purposes of the United States warehouse act, for which \$59,620 is appropriated. How many men will be engaged in this work?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the enforcement of the warehouse act has progressed so little thus far that what I would say to him would be almost a rough guess. The committee accepted, in view of this situation, the recommendation of the department on it, with the feeling that they themselves could not very well tell how many men they would need in this service. The warehouse act is just beginning to be organized within the past week, and these estimates were made up some time ago, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The department asks for approximately \$60,000 to begin the work?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the committee has recommended approximately that amount?

Mr. LEVER. We recommended what the department asks, which is a small increase in the amount carried in the bill. The act itself carries an appropriation of \$50,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The Secretary will fix the salaries in this instance as in the Government grain-grades act?

Mr. LEVER. Precisely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will they come up through the civil service or be appointed originally?

Mr. LEVER. They will be appointed originally under civil-service examination.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Can the gentleman indicate what their salaries will be? I am asking this because this is a

peculiar bill, although a very important one, in that appropriations are made in a lump sum and there is no way to ascertain just what men are receiving or what they ought to receive unless we ask these questions at this time.

Mr. LEVER. Certainly. The salaries under this item, as I gather it from the gentlemen who are in charge of the act, will range from \$3,600 down to about \$2,000 in the supervisory positions.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What kind of employees will be necessary to earn \$3,000 or thereabouts?

Mr. LEVER. The man who would draw a salary of \$3,000 or \$3,500 ought to be a man who possesses not only a great deal of technical skill in the grading and classing of cotton and other farm products mentioned in this act, but he also ought to have considerable executive and administrative ability.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. How many employees have been necessary up to date?

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think there have not been more than one or two in this work. They have just organized. This is simply a case of trusting the good judgment of the department.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is all new work, and these are new places created or to be created?

Mr. LEVER. New work; yes, sir.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Markets, \$1,670,075.

Mr. MANN. Will not the gentleman from South Carolina ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the total? There should be a correction here.

Mr. LEVER. Yes. But before doing that, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page—

Mr. MANN. Let us get the authority to correct the total.

Mr. LEVER. I ask unanimous consent first, then, that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals.

Mr. MANN. Throughout the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the totals throughout the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Now I ask unanimous consent to return to page 36, line 24, in order to offer an amendment to correct an error.

Mr. HAWLEY. That has already been done, has it not?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; but we have to reinsert it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 36, line 24, in lieu of "\$6,009" insert "\$16,009."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the committee will remember that the bill provided for \$16,009 for the Oregon Forest. The Book of Estimates, which is before the committee, carries \$6,009. Acting upon the assumption that the estimate was correct, I asked to correct the bill. The gentleman from Minnesota called the attention of the committee to it. Now I have information, through a letter from the Chief of the Forest Service, that the amount in the estimate was incorrect, and not the amount in the bill, so that the bill ought to carry \$16,009 for the Oregon National Forest. I ask unanimous consent to make that correction. That is just what is printed in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to the item on page 64, lines 10 to 13, with a purpose of offering the amendment which I submitted to the committee this morning, and which was temporarily passed over at the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I now offer the amendment, to follow line 13, page 64. It is in the hands of the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 64, to follow line 13, insert the following: "The Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the erecting of modern fireproof buildings for the use of the Department of Agriculture for a period not to exceed five years, renewable at the option of the Government for an additional period not exceeding five years, at annual rentals not to exceed the amount herein appropriated at a rate per annum per square foot of available floor space not to exceed 34 cents."

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. MANN. I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa and the gentleman from Illinois reserve a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the same phraseology, virtually, as that carried in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill of last year, conferring authorization upon the Attorney General and the Secretary of Labor to rent buildings for a term of years, except that the rental has been changed from 36.3 cents to 34 cents per square foot.

The reason for the modification is that the Secretary of Labor has been enabled to enter into a contract under these terms at a rental of less than 34 cents—namely, 33.3 cents—and the Attorney General has been enabled to enter into a contract for a building which I regard as the best private office building recently constructed for the use of the Government, at Vermont Avenue and K Street, at 34 cents. The Department of Agriculture has been renting modern office buildings at rates under terms of merely one year. They have not been able to secure as good terms from the owners because of the restricted terms. This amendment, I hope, will enable the Government to obtain the same liberal and reasonable terms to the Government as have been secured by the Department of Justice and the Department of Labor for their use.

We are acquainted with the building specially constructed for the use of the Bureau of Chemistry, which can not compare, either in construction or architectural beauty, with the fine office building that is just about to be opened for occupancy by the Department of Justice, a building with two stories finished with sandstone, and upper stories finished in modern style. The buildings that will be used by the Department of Justice will be in a neighborhood where the valuation of land is not nearly so high as that of those that have been constructed for the use of the other departments of the Government, and I really believe that the Secretary of Agriculture, under these terms, permitting him to enter into a contract for at least five years, renewable at the option of the Government for another five years in case the Government needs the building for that extended period, will be enabled to obtain for the Government quarters at much less than 30 cents per square foot. This amendment is along the line of economy, and I hope there will be no objection to its adoption.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. HAUGEN. Can the gentleman give the House any information as to what is proposed to be done or where these buildings are to be constructed?

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] on Saturday obtained unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture containing data as to the cost of present space used by the various bureaus of the Department of Agriculture, which is found on pages 1091 to 1094 of the RECORD. In that letter the Secretary of Agriculture points out that at the present time for quarters for the work of the grain standards we are paying as high as \$1.12 per square foot in the Munsey Building. That, it is true, includes the cost of care, upkeep, and elevator service, whereas this rate of 34 cents would be merely for the rental of the floor space, with the upkeep to be borne by the department.

It is the desire of the Secretary of Agriculture to withdraw these activities from these high-priced, down-town office buildings into a rented building near the department. Saturday afternoon, after the adjournment of the House, I happened to walk, as is my wont, through the Mall, and there I saw preparations being made, I assumed, for the erection of a building for the use of the department, right east of the present Agricultural Department building, the ground being all fenced in.

Mr. HAUGEN. How far from the department building?

Mr. STAFFORD. Immediately east of the department building. Whether it is to be used for that purpose I can not say. It seemed to me that it was on Government property, and it was all fenced off, had a large derrick and the necessary construction to chute the fluid concrete down into the reinforced forms, and ready to go ahead. Whether that is so or not, I do not know, but it is the intention of the Secretary to obtain contracts from owners near the present quarters, so as to have all the activities of the Agricultural Department focused around the present departmental building and withdrawn from the high-priced, rented private buildings down town. That is his policy.

The Department of Justice have secured floor space of 120,000 square feet in this new building at Vermont Avenue and K Street, enabling them to center all their activities in one building. Prior to this time they have been in four or five buildings scattered throughout the city, distant from the office of the Attorney General, and in some instances paying as high rental as \$1 or more per square foot, such as is paid in the Southern Building. Any person who is in favor of this economy will favor this proposition. It is along the lines recommended by the

Secretary of Agriculture, and we all know that that department has had considerable additional activities thrown upon it by the warehouse act and the grain-standards act, which have required additional room. They have not that available space at present, and must necessarily have gone into the new office buildings, such as the Munsey Building.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the situation in reference to the buildings of the department is clearly stated in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture on page 1091 of the RECORD of last Saturday, January 6, 1917.

There is a \$20,000 increase provided for in the bill, and the Secretary of Agriculture says that the object of this \$20,000 increase in rent is to concentrate the buildings of the Agricultural Department. He says:

If the increase of \$20,000 in the rental appropriation is granted, therefore, the department intends to make every effort to secure a building of considerable size. If it can secure a new, modern, fireproof office building providing, say, 100,000 square feet of floor space, this will not exceed our immediate present needs. The Office of Markets, with the cotton standards, grain standards, and warehouse legislation to execute and no quarters for the additional employees needed, has been forced to rent high-priced offices in the Munsey Building away from the bureau headquarters; the Forest Service is seriously hampered for space; certain units of the States Relations Service are crowded to a point where efficient work is almost impossible; and the Bureau of Chemistry, the Bureau of Biological Survey, the Federal Horticultural Board, and other branches of the department are in urgent need of more room. The department feels very strongly that its plea for immediate relief, represented by the \$20,000 increase proposed in the rent fund, is thoroughly justified by actual present conditions, and that it can not properly execute the tasks laid upon it by Congress without such relief.

He states further in this letter:

In conclusion, I wish to lay before you a few figures to indicate something of the growth of the Department of Agriculture in recent years. The new buildings known as laboratories A and B were authorized in 1903, and for that fiscal year the total appropriations to the department were \$5,015,846. The buildings were completed and occupied in March, 1908. For that fiscal year the total appropriations were \$13,037,802, of which \$12,595,502 was actually disbursed. The department had outgrown the new buildings before they were completed. Since 1908 the growth has continued, and for the fiscal year 1917 the total appropriations are \$36,128,852, or nearly three times the disbursements in 1908. The disbursements for rent in 1908 were \$65,705, and for 1917 will be about \$142,000, or about two and one-quarter times what they were in 1908. The appropriation for rent has therefore not kept pace with the growth of the department, and the result is a serious overcrowding in many bureaus.

The Secretary further states that the average rental per square foot gross is 30 cents a square foot throughout this department. The average rental in the other departments of the Government is, in the State Department 49 cents per square foot, in the Treasury Department 35.3 cents, in the Navy Department 37 cents, in the Interior Department 35.4 cents, in the Post Office Department 34.5 cents, in the Department of Justice 41.2 cents, in the Department of Commerce 35 cents, in the Department of Labor 35.8 cents. So it shows that the amount paid by the Agricultural Department is lower, on the average, than is paid by any other department.

This amendment provides that the amount of the expenditure for annual rental shall not exceed the amount herein appropriated—that is, \$143,689—and it would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to lease modern fireproof buildings for the use of the Department of Agriculture for a period not exceeding five years, renewable at the option of the Government for an additional period of not exceeding five years. The rate per annum per square foot of available floor space is not to exceed 34 cents. Therefore they would not have any authority to go above 34 cents, and, of course, the Department of Agriculture would make the best trade possible, and would secure the necessary floor space at less than 34 cents per square foot if it was possible for them to do so.

Mr. FESS. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I am wondering why we do not build instead of scattering the activities of the various departments in rented buildings.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I am going to reach that. If the Department of Agriculture should be able to make a contract for a fireproof building at 34 cents, it would be at figure less than is being paid by the other departments of the Government. If the department should be able to make additional contracts at the rate they are now paying, it would be 30 cents per square foot.

There is no question but what the department requires these buildings. There is no doubt about that in the world, because the Secretary of Agriculture states in the letter which he wrote to me that the department had already outgrown the main buildings before the construction of them was completed and before the department had an opportunity to occupy them. They are paying rent in the Munsey Building at \$1.12 per square foot.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. In many parts of the country the rent is higher even than that. In Boston the rent is \$2.22 per square foot, where it is necessary to acquire floor space for an office to carry on investigations under the grain-standards act. Therefore, as was said a moment ago by the gentleman from Wisconsin, this provision is in the interest of economy and will result in economy to the Government if adopted.

The department has been anxious for years to secure enactment of just such a provision as this. They have had it in former bills, but it went out on a point of order, as it will go out now if insisted upon, but I trust that my splendid and genial friend from Iowa, who is always in favor of economy and the improvement of the service, will not insist on his point of order, but will let the House have an opportunity to vote on this proposition.

The question was asked a moment ago by the gentleman from Ohio why we do not build buildings instead of renting them. I am frank to say to my good friend that I favor building all the buildings that are necessary for the use of the Government of the United States. There is not a business man in the country who has the money or who could secure it at a reasonable rate of interest but would construct buildings for the transaction of his business rather than continually rent them, because the hardest money to pay is rent money, and when you once pay it it is gone and you have no interest in the building and have no benefit to be derived from it after the expiration of your term of rental. Therefore I believe that we should exercise good business judgment if we would build buildings for every department of the Government in the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman think we ought to finish the present agricultural building between the two wings that have been built?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I certainly do.

Mr. MANN. I think if the powerful Committee on Agriculture would put its shoulder to the wheel it could get an amendment to the public-building bill for that purpose.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I would be willing to put my shoulder to the wheel to bring it about, if possible to do so.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. I have heard it stated several times within the last three or four years that contracts have been made by the Government for a building for the use of the Government and that the rentals have paid for the building itself within a period of 10 years. Is that within the belief and knowledge of the gentleman, who has paid some attention to that matter?

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have not the information on that point. Now, I want to make one further statement and I am through, and that is that the Secretary of Agriculture himself—and I speak by authority—is anxious to have this provision put in the bill. I have communicated with the Agricultural Department, and if this is adopted it will not only meet his approval but he is exceedingly anxious that it should be adopted in order that he may bring about convenient location and concentration of the buildings occupied by that department; and, further, that if adopted it will result in economy and the saving of money to the Government.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I infer from the statement of the gentleman that the object now is to construct a building on the site selected for a department building, as was done three or four years ago, when a six or seven story building was erected south of the department building on a site selected for a department building.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated that I had no knowledge, except I noticed while casually walking through the Mall last Saturday afternoon that they are proceeding with the construction of a building on what I believe is Government property. If the gentleman is acquainted with the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture concerning the item as carried in the appropriation bill, he will realize that without this amendment the Secretary of Agriculture intends to rent a building, under an annual lease, because he says if you grant him the \$20,000 additional he will proceed to enter into a contract for a modern fireproof building. What would the contract be? Only for a year. My amendment is only for the purpose of trying to secure a lower rate, authorizing him to enter into a contract for five years, which will en-

able him to secure a lower rate. The purpose of the gentleman from Iowa will not be accomplished by making a point of order. The only purpose obtained by him, if he succeeds in his point of order, will be to obtain a higher rate.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, as I have said, if it is the purpose to erect a building on the site or in the immediate vicinity of the site selected for a department building, I feel compelled to make the point of order. If it is contemplated to enter into a contract to hire a new building, I trust the Secretary will exercise better judgment than he did four years ago in hiring a building constructed on the site selected for a department building, and which, of course, will defeat the plan of constructing a department building in the near future.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The gentleman refers to the building across the street?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes; I believe it is called the Bieber Building, on the site selected for the department. I understand it is the purpose to put a building on the other corner, which will defeat the plan of building a department building in the near future.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Would it not be an enlargement of the present building?

Mr. HAUGEN. The building that was built three or four years ago would have to be torn down and necessitate paying for it, thus incurring an additional expense of several hundred thousand dollars. I take it that no one would construct a building at an expense of several hundred thousand dollars with a lease for one year, although they might with a lease for five or six years.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes that we must trust the heads of departments to exercise some discretion, and that they will do nothing contrary to public policy. The Secretary under the authorization, without the amendment, of course, could go ahead and rent a modern fireproof building, to utilize the \$18,000 now paid for use of the Forestry Service, with \$20,000 additional, and enter into a contract for one year—and we know that the owner would have the contract for several years to come—and in the new building merge the several activities now carried on in outside quarters. This amendment only enables the Government to secure better terms.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will give assurance that the building will not be constructed on the site or in its immediate vicinity, I shall withdraw the point of order, but I object to putting up any further buildings on the location selected.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can give the gentleman this assurance, that under that authorization carried in the bill he will go ahead and, as stated in his letter, enter into a contract for a modern building, and this amendment will merely enable him to get better terms.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be granted five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa referred to property just south of the Agricultural Building.

Mr. HAUGEN. Exactly.

Mr. MANN. As a site selected for the Agricultural Building?

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That is news to me. Who selected that site, when was it selected, and by what authority?

Mr. HAUGEN. That was selected at the time when Col. Roosevelt was President of the United States, and, as the gentleman knows, instead of putting up a complete department building they put up two wings over there, and, of course, the plan was to complete it at some future time.

Mr. MANN. But I do not think those plans contemplated going across the street.

Mr. HAUGEN. I was so informed by the Secretary of Agriculture, and by different people in the department.

Mr. MANN. I think that is an error. The plan contemplated a building to be constructed between the two wings.

Mr. HAUGEN. Oh, the main entrance—that is true.

Mr. MANN. No; the other. I do not think they contemplated going across B Street SW.

Mr. HAUGEN. It is exactly what was contemplated, a square building with a large court.

Mr. MANN. I quite agree with the gentleman that it would be desirable to have a new Agricultural Building, but I doubt whether it would be desirable to close up B Street.

Mr. HAUGEN. That is why I am objecting to these leases, and, as I have said, if the gentleman can give me any assurance that the buildings to be constructed are not to be constructed on the site or in its immediate vicinity, I will withdraw

my point of order. This is a matter that has been before Congress for a number of years. We have succeeded heretofore in defeating it, and I trust it will be defeated now.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I am not authorized to speak with certainty, but I think the gentleman can be assured that if the ultimate authority is given in this provision that is pending no building will be permitted to be constructed or leased by the Agricultural Department upon any site where it is contemplated to build the agricultural building, because we expect to finish that building some of these days, and I hope it will be done very soon. I am frank to say, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois a moment ago, that I have no information myself that this building across the street is on that site, or that it was contemplated that the agricultural building when completed would cross B Street SW. so that part of it would be constructed on the other side, thereby crossing the street car track that runs along that street. I do not think that that would be done, but if it was contemplated originally under the plan as suggested by the gentleman, permit me to say that that is now barred by the statute of limitations and I do not think that we would be permitted to have it done.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. HAUGEN. I shall have to insist upon the point of order unless I can have some information as to where this building is to be constructed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would the gentleman be satisfied if we placed a limitation upon the amendment to the effect that no contract or lease shall be entered into for a building to be erected on property on which it is contemplated to construct a Government building for the Department of Agriculture for which plans have been prepared?

Mr. HAUGEN. I shall not object to it if you put that limitation on.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. What is that?

Mr. STAFFORD. A limitation that no contract or lease shall be entered into for a building to be constructed on property on which it is contemplated to construct a building for which plans have been prepared for the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. I have no objection to that.

Mr. HAUGEN. I suggest that the gentleman get the desired necessary information so that he can inform the House exactly what it is proposed to do.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, if the gentleman had read the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture printed in the RECORD of Saturday, he would have come to the conclusion that under the amount now carried in the appropriation bill the Secretary of Agriculture has authority to enter into a contract of lease and intends to enter into a lease for one year for a modern fireproof building to merge the activities of the department, and it is common sense that if the Secretary of Agriculture enters into a contract for but one year, he can not get as favorable terms as if he entered into a contract of lease for a longer period. The amendment I propose is for that purpose, and nothing more.

Mr. HAUGEN. If we are to discuss common sense, then we will move part of the department to the Maltby Building. Furthermore, I suggest that the department should take some notice of the direction given by Congress.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman was as well acquainted with general matters—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman from Iowa was as well acquainted with conditions pertaining to the Maltby Building as he is generally with matters pertaining to the Government, he would know that Congress authorized the razing of that building.

Mr. HAUGEN. The gentleman from Iowa knows that Congress two years ago decided that it should not be demolished; the Agriculture bill was so amended in the Senate and conference.

Mr. STAFFORD. A provision was carried in one of the appropriation bills last year authorizing the razing of the building.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 64, at the end of line 13, insert as a new paragraph as follows: "For the completion of the Agriculture Department building, \$2,000,000."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask the Clerk to read the following resolution in my two minutes.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 436.

Whereas there has been undue and unnecessary friction between the correlative branches of Government located respectively in Wall Street, N. Y., and Washington, D. C.; and

Whereas the Washington branch held the opinion that peace was to the advantage of the Nation and the world, where Wall Street more largely profited by a state of war; and

Whereas the President of the United States in ignorance or heedlessness of Wall Street interests, did humbly ask the nations at war whether in their respective views it might not be well to consider the possibility of desisting from slaughter; and

Whereas it has been alleged that rumors of such diabolical questioning reached some of the speculators of Wall Street before it reached others, to the result of inequality of profit among said speculators: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That all rumors of such leakage of information be pursued to their lairs and that the Rules Committee of the House examine all brokers, newspapers, ticker tapes, secretaries, stenographers, Members of the House and Senate, and all sources of news, rumors, and lies, including all liars, ancient, modern, and prehistoric; and further be it

Resolved, That out of the contingent fund of the House be paid all losses accruing to speculators in Wall Street stocks for the week of December 18 to December 24, 1916; and furthermore be it

Resolved, That the President and each and every Representative, Senator, Cabinet officer, stenographer, and clerk be assessed one month's pay toward the restitution aforesaid; and be it further

Resolved, That it shall not happen again.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman offers that as a new paragraph to the bill, then I make a point of order on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to meet the emergency caused by the existence of the pink boll worm of cotton in Mexico and the movement of some 500 carloads of cotton seed from the infested districts in Mexico to milling points in Texas and elsewhere, and to prevent the establishment of such insect in Texas or in any other State by providing for adequate inspection and the employment of all means necessary, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him, to prohibit the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States, including the examination of baggage and railroad cars or other means of conveyance and the cleaning and disinfection thereof; to inspect mills in Texas or elsewhere in the United States to which Mexican cotton seed has been taken for milling; to supervise the destruction, by manufacture or otherwise, of such seed and the thorough clean-up of the mills and premises; to conduct local surveys and inspections of cotton fields in the vicinity of such mills and ports of entry in order to detect any instances of local infestation, and to determine and conduct such control measures in cooperation with the State of Texas, or other States concerned, as may be necessary to stamp out such infestation, including rent outside of the District of Columbia, employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$50,000, available immediately and until expended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph, or I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit me to dispose of this matter; then he can find a place?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to state to the committee that the message from the Secretary of Agriculture to Congress acquainting it with the condition to which this item refers has been referred to the Committee on Appropriations. That committee has jurisdiction of deficiency appropriations, or appropriations of a character like this, and will undoubtedly give consideration to this matter. Under those circumstances, unless the gentleman can advance some good reason, I will be constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman is going to make the point of order—of course I recognize the fact that this is a deficiency appropriation and is subject to the point of order, but I desire to say to the gentleman that which he knows, that this item was estimated for in a supplemental estimate which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, at least the letter of the Secretary was. The committee at that time was in session, had not completed its bill, and the chairman of the committee had information before the estimate was submitted that it was to be submitted, and when Dr. Marlatt, who has charge of the work of the Horticultural Board, was before the committee the committee undertook to get some information from Dr. Marlatt in regard to the pink boll-worm situation.

Now, while I recognize the fact that we have transgressed the rules of the House in bringing in a deficiency appropriation, at the same time this work is being done by the department and

is of a character that is really in the province of the Committee on Agriculture; and, in addition to that, if the gentleman will permit me, it was brought to the attention of the committee that the seriousness of this situation had not been brought to the notice of the Department of Agriculture until the 1st of November, 1916, long after the estimates had been submitted. I would say further that from information we had the pink boll worm is regarded by the experts of the department as being even more destructive to cotton, if that is possible, than the boll weevil itself. This is a worm that immigrated, I presume you might say, from India to Egypt, and through the dissemination of Egyptian cotton it has spread into all parts of the world except North America, and the department had not discovered, as I said a moment ago, until November of last year that it had reached North America and was now present in the cotton of Mexico. It has also been discovered that from the infected region in Mexico there has come into Texas probably 400 tons of cotton seed—

Mr. HAWLEY. Five hundred carloads.

Mr. LEVER. Four hundred carloads of cotton seed, which are being ground and pressed by the Texas cotton-oil mills. The purpose of this proposal here is to enable the department not only to quarantine against further importations of cotton or cotton seed from Mexico so as to make a quarantine against Egypt, India, and the balance of the world, but at the same time to give authority to supervise and clean up all the cottonseed oil concerns into which these infected seed have gone. It is not certain, by any means, that the seed are infected, but they come from an infected district, and the seriousness of the situation is so great that the department felt and the committee unanimously felt that we ought not to take any risks with it; and therefore we submitted it in this shape. Of course I realize it is subject to the point of order, but I hope the gentleman will not press it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman acknowledges it is a deficiency appropriation.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, undoubtedly.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not question the exigency or character of the condition requiring the attention of the Department of Agriculture, but we have a committee on appropriations which brings in deficiency bills from time to time carrying emergency appropriations, and I do not question but what if the case is exigent and if the matter is presented to the Committee on Appropriations, as the communication in reference to this matter has been so referred, that it would be embodied in the next emergency deficiency bill, which bill will very likely become a law before this bill is enacted into law. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Was the point of order made on the whole paragraph?

Mr. STAFFORD. On the whole paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Demonstrations on reclamation projects: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and aid in the agricultural development of the Government reclamation projects; to assist, through demonstrations, advice, and in other ways, settlers on the projects; and for the employment of persons and means necessary in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$40,000.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said in the last few months on this floor and elsewhere relative to the dairies and creameries of this country, and resolutions galore have been introduced and statements have been made of the evidence that the Rules Committee of this House developed. I desire to read what the evidence before the Rules Committee last April did develop, and was uncontradicted, relative to the dairy and creamery interests of the United States.

First. That in dairy States of the Union there are, many of recent origin, but all working at this time, effective laws governing the supervision and inspection of dairies and creameries, and in practically every case the laws are being effectively enforced.

Second. That of the commercial dairy products more than 60 per cent are pasteurized and that pasteurization is steadily increasing in every part of the country.

Third. That the large majority of dairy and creamery products which enter into interstate commerce, we believe amounting to 75 per cent, is pasteurized.

Fourth. We are convinced that no industry in this country having to do with the production and handling of human food has made an advancement in purity and sanitation equal to that of dairy and creamery products during the last five years.

Fifth. That the state of purity and wholesomeness of commercial creamery and dairy products in this country is farther advanced than almost any country in the world.

I have quoted from the undisputed testimony of William T. Creasy, secretary of the National Dairy Union of the United States.

There are 46,000 creameries and cream stations in the United States. Five years ago the Department of Agriculture took up

an investigation and sent two or three untried young men into 6 States, which 6 States out of the 48 the Department of Agriculture has not vouchsafed a statement. Information as to which of those creameries and dairy stations were examined was refused the people interested in a statement. A classification of the various stations and creameries examined was denied the dairy people of the United States, but it was admitted that of the 144 examined a good many of them were condemned because they were not painted on the outside, and that there were not proper walks around the outside.

Out of the multiplied millions of bodies of cream from the creameries in this country during the investigation they examined 1,500. Upon these, five years ago, they practically condemned the dairy and creamery interests of this country and made it the basis for investigations, and frequent charges made upon the floor of this House. Reiterated unwarranted attacks have been made against one of the leading industries of the United States and the most important industry in the matter of preserving and conserving the fertility of our soil.

Now, then, reference was made the other day by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] to the dairy interests and the alleged bad condition of the industry in this country. I notice that just a short time ago over in the city of Baltimore the National Federation of Labor was induced to adopt a resolution, of which I shall read one of the paragraphs of the preamble, as follows:

Whereas a hearing was had on House resolution 137 on April 11, 1916, before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, at which time Dr. E. C. Schroeder, expert bacteriologist of the Department of Agriculture, stated to the committee that 300 children die annually in New York City of bovine tuberculosis, and on this basis the annual death rate in the United States from bovine tuberculosis is 6,000 children every year, and further said that over 9 per cent, or 2,000,000, of our dairy cows have tuberculosis and are capable of transmitting that disease to children; while Dr. John R. Mohler, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, told the committee that he had personally examined the bodies of a number of children who died of tuberculosis and found that over 22 per cent had died from bovine tuberculosis.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to read to the committee the evidence upon which that very sweeping statement was made. Beginning on page 23, of the hearings before the Rules Committee, I read:

A few years ago, basing an estimate on the available data of the kind supplied by the New York health office, a tuberculosis expert in Canada—

Not in the United States, but an expert in Canada—

whose paper was afterwards published in the transactions of the Canadian Tuberculosis Association, estimated that there were annually about 400 deaths from bovine tuberculosis in Canada. If we take the population of Canada and compare it with the population of New York City, the figures compare about as 4 for Canada and 3 for New York. On the basis of similar data it has been estimated that approximately 300 deaths from bovine tuberculosis occur annually in New York City, and this again gives the ratio of 4 and 3, and since New York City has about one-twentieth of the population of the United States, we have simply to multiply the 300 deaths from bovine tuberculosis per annum in New York City by 20 to get an approximate idea of the number of deaths from bovine tuberculosis in the United States, and this gives us rather a large number.

Now, that is what Dr. Schroeder said and that is the evidence upon which the sweeping charge was made by the great Federation of Labor. Its committee on resolutions evidently had been imposed upon by some one as to what the hearings actually contained. That is an estimate not based upon any investigation. But solely upon one man's estimate that 400 people died in Canada during the year from bovine tuberculosis, and that Canada has one-third more people than the city of New York. Therefore 300 infants died of bovine tuberculosis in New York in one year, and New York City being one-twentieth of the United States, the total for the country would be 6,000, the number given in the resolution, which is one of the most remarkable pieces of logic, and one of the most winding exhibitions of ratiocination of which I ever heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I will not object if the gentleman will yield for a couple of questions.

Mr. SLOAN. What are your questions?

Mr. LINTHICUM. You have not been granted the time yet.

Mr. SLOAN. I asked it. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not. I merely ask you if you will answer a couple of questions of mine?

Mr. SLOAN. I am not making any advance agreement.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to hear what the gentleman has to say, and I do not object to it. If you want to excuse this tuberculosis in cattle, go ahead and do it. I have no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. I am not excusing tuberculosis in cattle. I am opposed to tuberculosis remaining in this country, I must in-

sist, however, that no Member of this House has a right to attack a great industry like the dairy industry of this country unless he has something on which to base it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I wish I could give you two other minutes for a better purpose than your excuse for tuberculosis in cattle which you are trying to give.

Mr. SLOAN. I am not taking my time from the gentleman from Maryland. The gentleman from Maryland or somebody else induced the federation to place itself in this further attitude of indorsing the testimony of one Dr. Mohler, who is described as telling the committee that he had personally examined the bodies of a number of children who died of tuberculosis and found that over 22 per cent had died of bovine tuberculosis. Why was not the federation's committee told that Mohler had examined only nine cases, each of them right up against Maryland, and that two of them seemed to have been due to bovine tuberculosis? The statement as it stands gives the public to understand that a general country-wide investigation had been made, involving so many cases that it had to be reduced to percentages in order to be grasped by the ordinary mind. In order to make it sound harsh and horrible it was put in percentage. This is the evidence of Dr. Mohler. He says:

My information is based on personal work in the laboratory, and consists of, first, the investigation of nine children that died of tuberculosis, and as a result of the study of the bacilli found in the bodies of these nine children definite and positive results were obtained from two of these cases indicating that the bovine tubercle bacillus was the responsible factor in producing death.

That was here at Washington.

I do not know who had the charm or the magnetism that led that great national organization to take up a great subject of this kind, and, instead of giving the precise fact, said 22 per cent. But here he had examined only nine cases, and instead of saying that two out of nine were traceable through some manner or means, we know not how, to bovine sources, gave it in percentage. Why, you can prove that one swallow makes a summer by the same brilliant logic.

Mr. CANNON. They are very modest in that statement.

Mr. SLOAN. Now, if the gentleman desires to ask me those questions.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; I want to ask the gentleman whether he read from the report issued by the Agricultural Department in reference to tuberculosis among cattle?

Mr. SLOAN. I did.

Mr. LINTHICUM. And did the gentleman notice that by the department figures there are about 2,000,000 of these cattle in this country?

Mr. SLOAN. I know that the distinguished Dr. Schroeder, who is quoted as authority by the gentleman from Maryland and is quoted as authority by the American Federation of Labor, testified five or six years ago that 22 per cent of the dairy cattle of the United States were afflicted with tuberculosis. Since that time he has modified his testimony and gives to the country now the information that only 9 per cent are thus afflicted.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is about 10 per cent.

Mr. SLOAN. I am correct. See page 25, hearings, testimony of Dr. Schroeder. And then he goes on to say that this change is based on the fact that when he estimated it at 22 per cent he was taking into consideration largely the cattle in the eastern part of the United States, I suppose in and around Maryland. [Laughter.] But having taken into account the cattle of all the country, and not leaving out those in the sacred precincts of Maryland, he found that with respect to the cattle which furnished largely the commercial milk, butter, and cheese for the people of the United States he had to reduce it from 22 per cent to 9 per cent. Now, if my mathematics are on straight, it would leave the larger portion of the tuberculous cattle to the States in the neighborhood of the gentleman from Maryland.

You know how they kept the streets of Jerusalem so clean in the ancient time, as the Scotchman said, "By every man keeping his ain front door clean"; and if the farmers represented by the gentleman from Maryland and thereabouts would do what the great creamery and dairy States of the Northwest have been doing during the last few years, namely, cleaning up their creameries and dairies and purifying their herds, they would be giving to the people in and outside of Maryland and neighboring States pure butter, milk, and cream, and the gentleman from Maryland would not have so much to say against a great legitimate industry of the United States whose product amounts to one billion annually. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman could say all he knows about it in one minute. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. I could not do that.

Mr. SLOAN. I think the gentleman could, according to his way of estimating percentages. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a new paragraph. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARNER:

"That the act of August 30, 1890, entitled 'An act providing for an inspection of meats for exportation, prohibiting the importation of adulterated articles of food or drink, and authorizing the President to make proclamation in certain cases, and for other purposes' (26 Stat. L., p. 414), is hereby amended so as to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, within his discretion and under such joint resolution as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Treasury, to permit the admission of tick-infested cattle from Mexico into those parts of the United States below the southern cattle quarantine line at such ports of entry as may be designated by said joint regulations, and also subject to the provisions of sections 7, 8, 9, and 10 of said act of August 30, 1890. That all such cattle when entered shall be subject to the regulations governing the handling and transportation of cattle from the districts infected with the splenic fever."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. LEVER. I wonder if the gentleman from Maryland would not let us read the next paragraph before he moves to strike out the last word?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative fire protection of forested watersheds of navigable streams: For cooperation with any State or group of States in the protection from fire of the forested watersheds of navigable streams under the provisions of section 2 of the act of March 1, 1911, entitled "An act to enable any State to cooperate with any other State or States, or with the United States, for the protection of the watersheds of navigable streams, and to appoint a commission for the acquisition of lands for the purpose of conserving the navigability of navigable rivers," \$100,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I am extremely sorry that the gentleman from Nebraska waxes so warm about this dairy question. It might be very well to keep the country clean according to the rules that he says existed some thousands of years ago in Jerusalem, by each man keeping his own front door clean, provided that would work. But that will not work in the dairy industry at this time. There was a time when it might have worked, when the dairies were small, and when the products came from immediate surrounding country and were sold in the immediate neighborhood. But in these times, when rapid trains carry these products from Wisconsin and Michigan and Minnesota and other States to Baltimore and to the whole country, and when cold storage can be used during the transportation of such products throughout the world, the question of keeping your own front door clean will not work. I contend that while the pasteurization of milk is all right, and that you can keep milk pure by that means, it is useless to try to contend that tuberculosis can be gotten rid of in that way when the infection can just as easily be communicated by means of meat; and why should we be subject to infection from diseased cattle when we can get rid of the diseased cattle at little cost?

Now, the gentleman must know this, because I assume he is a farmer—in fact, I know he is a farmer—

Mr. SLOAN. I am. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. You stand accredited as being a farmer. Good.

Mr. SLOAN. I stand complimented. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; complimented that the gentleman is a farmer.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I can certify that he is a farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from Pennsylvania certifies that he is a farmer. It needs no proof. But the fact is you could have a cow on your farm, could be selling the milk to a dairy without inspection, and it might go into the butter, and thus be taken into the homes of the children of this country without inspection—in many of the States without pasteurization. Again, if that cow reached the stage where it was too old to produce profitable milk any further and you wanted to send it to the slaughterhouse, the Government official would condemn it, and it would at once be converted into fertilizer.

Now, why should you go on producing cattle and milk which go into the stomachs of the children of this country in that raw state when the Government would not allow that it should go into the children's stomachs in a cooked state? You want pasteurization as a last resort, but what we want to do is to get rid of the cattle themselves.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] stated the other day that it would cost \$210,000,000 to get rid of these tuberculous cattle.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Let me make my statement first.

Mr. HAUGEN. Just one brief statement. That was the statement made by the representative of the department.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That it would cost \$210,000,000?

Mr. HAUGEN. No; about \$600,000,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes. The gentleman bases that upon cattle which are healthy.

Mr. HAUGEN. I base it upon 10 per cent of the dairy cows and 8 per cent of the other cows.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes; cows that are healthy. But suppose the gentleman would take these tuberculous cows that he is talking about and would attempt to sell them for meat purposes. What would happen? They would be condemned instantly and turned into fertilizer.

Mr. HAUGEN. Only the infected parts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Well, there would not be much left of a tuberculous cow that anyone would want to eat.

Now, I do not want to get too warm about this legislation. The American Federation of Labor are interested in it, as they are interested in many things which need attention. They are interested in protecting the homes and lives of the working classes of this country. They are interested in protecting those people who can not always get the finest milk and the finest butter and the finest cream that the country produces. They are interested in the poor man, who needs protection at the hands of this Congress, and that is why the workingman is interested in this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes, to allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. LEVER. I hope the gentleman will not ask that. We want to get on with the bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I do not ask for any extension.

Mr. HAUGEN. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LEVER. Let the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$60,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I assume that this is the item that was originally introduced in order to take care of the cane-sugar planters of Louisiana when the Underwood tariff bill, containing the free-sugar item, was passed.

Mr. LEVER. This is a matter that was introduced by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROUSSARD] who is now a Senator. It was offered as an amendment and inserted on the floor of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was the reason advanced for making the special exception?

Mr. LEVER. I do not remember the statement that was made in connection with it. It was some three or four years ago.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am quite surprised that the gentleman does not remember everything in connection with this bill. He does not seem to in this one instance.

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is the only man who always remembers everything.

Mr. STAFFORD. I will not accept that statement.

Mr. LEVER. It is intended as a compliment.

Mr. STAFFORD. No compliment. It is mere idle palaver. The gentleman is certainly acquainted with the purpose of this item.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; I am.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the original purpose is at an end, why is it continued in the bill any longer?

Mr. LEVER. This item was inserted in the bill—if the gentleman is serious about it—

Mr. STAFFORD. I am entirely serious.

Mr. LEVER. I thought the gentleman was jocular.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would not take up the time of the committee unless I was serious in calling attention to the uselessness of carrying the item in the bill after the purpose for which it was inserted has passed.

Mr. LEVER. This item was inserted in the bill on the floor of the House at the suggestion of Representative BROUSSARD, who has now become a Member of the Senate. It was debated here for quite a little while, as the gentleman will recall. I am inclined to think—to be perfectly frank, as I was in a humorous frame of mind a moment ago—that the author of that amendment did have in mind the idea of helping the cane-sugar growers of his own State. I will say very frankly also that my own view was at that time and is now that the investigations conducted under this item are very much larger than the problems that relate peculiarly to the cane growers of Louisiana. It is really a kind of an experiment station in that section of the country, and the work so far, I think, has been satisfactory to every member of the committee. Whether or not it was wise to start it in the beginning is a matter over which the committee had very little control, because, as I said, it came in as an amendment on the floor of the House.

Mr. STAFFORD. It only shows that when once a work is undertaken by the Government—

Mr. LEVER. It is very hard to get rid of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. No matter whether the original purpose is accomplished or not, it goes on forever.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have a recollection of this item, which has been in the bill for several years, and think I can enlighten the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] who seeks information on the subject. Perhaps I can tell him what he wishes to know. My recollection is that after the low-tariff law went into effect there was quite a depreciation in the sugar business in Louisiana. In fact, in anticipation of losses due to the Democrats having come into power in the Nation, threatening a low-tariff law that would work havoc all over the good old Democratic State of Louisiana, it was suggested that a little help from Congress—not in the way of a tariff, which the Democrats detest, and charge up only to the manufacturing industries—a little help from Congress by way of developing live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts—which meant in this instance only Louisiana—might be a good thing for Louisiana. And so, of course, without regard to any special favors to anybody, and with face front against the "special interests," this item of \$60,000 was introduced into this bill in order that our friends in Louisiana who suffered loss by reason of the Democratic policy of free trade and the destruction of the sugar industry in Louisiana might recoup to a certain extent. The idea was that, to the extent of \$60,000, barns and other necessary buildings might be erected and certain men employed in the redevelopment of the sugar-cane business, and so forth.

Now, this sort of back-handed assistance has been given in other instances. The other day, when this same bill was under consideration, we inquired about appropriations for pursuing the Canadian potato scab or wart. An embargo against the potato wart was put on by the administration some time after the Democratic Party, following out its policy of free trade, had put potatoes on the free list. There had come over from Canada such a tremendous avalanche of potatoes, competing with the product of Maine, that the error of the Democratic Party was at once apparent. The Democratic administration did not restore the duty, but it put on an embargo that was more effective than the war in Europe in keeping Canadian potatoes out of this country. That might have restrained the farmers of Maine from voting against the Democratic Party, but it did not.

I would like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to understand thoroughly, since he seems to seek light on the subject, just why these things are put in here once in a while, to remedy some of the errors of the Democratic Party. They help to reassure the people that while Democracy stands for free trade in theory, in reality they are for protection in fact, even if it requires an appropriation. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. KELLEY. Does the gentleman mean to say that the Canadian potato scab has done more for the potato farmer of America than the Democratic Party has done for him?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Of course. Immediately when these Canadian potatoes came rushing over the border under the free-trade policy of the Democratic Party there was nothing to do to save the vote in Maine except to put on the embargo against Canadian potatoes.

Mr. BORLAND. Can the gentleman tell us where these potatoes are now that have been rushing in over the border in such a flood?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, yes; under the European war conditions and the Democratic method of reducing the high cost of living they have reached as high as \$2 a bushel to the ordinary consumer. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter, for the purpose of reducing the expense of enforcing and administering the several statutes conferring powers or imposing duties upon the Secretary of Agriculture, he shall have authority from time to time to make designations of officers, agents, and employees of the Department of Agriculture to administer oaths, of which designations the courts of the United States shall take judicial notice. Any such officer, agent, or employee so designated is hereby empowered to administer to, or take from, any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit whenever such oath, affirmation, or affidavit is for use in any prosecution or proceeding under, or in the administration of, any law which the Secretary of Agriculture or the Department of Agriculture, or any bureau or subdivision thereof, is, or may hereafter be, empowered or directed to administer or to aid in administering. Any such oath, affirmation, or affidavit administered or taken by or before such officer, agent, or employee, when certified under his hand and authenticated by the official seal of the Department of Agriculture, shall be valid to all intents and purposes, and when offered or used in any court of the United States shall have like force and effect as if administered or taken by or before the clerk of such court, without further proof of the identity or authority of such officer, agent, or employee. No officer, agent, or employee of the Department of Agriculture shall demand or accept any fee or compensation whatsoever for administering or taking any oath, affirmation, or affidavit under the authority conferred by this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. This paragraph apparently confers a very large authority upon the innumerable employees and agents connected with the Department of Agriculture scattered all over the country. A casual reading of the paragraph will show that summary power is conferred upon them. It is possible that it may be abused, and I think the chairman is called upon to make some explanation of the need of it.

Mr. LEVER. I will try to do it briefly. This matter was introduced in the form of a bill and referred to the subcommittee, of which I was not a member. The statement that is made to the committee is that the new language is desired in order to decrease the cost of preparing cases for prosecution and to eliminate to a considerable extent the difficulty now experienced in getting these cases into court. I will read:

The necessity of this measure may well be illustrated by the procedure in connection with the enforcement of the food and drugs act. The proceedings are criminal under section 2 of the act and civil under section 10. Most of the criminal cases are prosecuted by information rather than by indictment, as such method seems expeditious and economical. In all cases prosecuted by information, affidavits showing probable cause for the prosecution are required of witnesses having personal knowledge of the facts. At least two affidavits are usually necessary for each case. Affidavits also frequently are required by the courts in seizure proceedings under section 10 of the act, where no claimant appears and it is necessary for the Government to proceed ex parte to secure a decree of condemnation. Such affidavits are taken in all parts of the United States, and the notarial fees range from 25 cents to \$1.

Probably the most important consideration in favor of the enactment of this paragraph is the fact that in many places where samples are purchased the only officers authorized to administer oaths whose certificates can be obtained are State officers, such as notaries public and justices of the peace, and their official acts and seals are not always recognized by the Federal courts. For instance, in the case of the United States v. Schallinger Produce Co. (230 Fed. Rep., 290), decided in 1914, in the district court of the United States for the eastern district of Washington, Judge Rudkin refused to accept affidavits subscribed and sworn to before notaries public and dismissed the Government's information on the ground that it was not supported by oath or affirmation. (See also U. S. v. Baumert et al., 179 Fed. Rep., 735.)

Since the publication of the decision in the Schallinger case many affidavits sworn to before notaries public have been returned to the department for reexecution before a clerk of a Federal court or a United States commissioner. This has seriously interfered with the efficient administration of the act, to say nothing of the increase in the cost of its administration and the unreasonable delay in bringing cases to trial. Unless relief from this situation is afforded by Congress, the universal application of Judge Rudkin's decision in all the Federal courts will seriously interfere with the enforcement of Federal statutes and greatly increase the cost of obtaining evidence of violations of law.

It is to obviate that situation that this language is inserted.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that there ought to be some restrictions in conferring this authority on every one connected with the Agricultural Department, field agents and all, so as not to permit them to go into a neighbor's or a stranger's home and say, "I am an agent of the Department of Agriculture, authorized to acquire information under the Bureau of Markets, and I ask you to give me the information desired"?

Mr. LEVER. I am willing to accept such an amendment. I am perfectly willing that this should go out on a point of order. I do not care much about it one way or the other, for it may be better to handle it in a separate bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think perhaps there is some need of such legislation, but I do not think that this can be amended satisfactorily on the spur of the moment. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. Borland: Page 86, line 25, insert "that no part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries, or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day except from technical and scientific experts."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and amendments thereto close in 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention again at this time to the fact that the Government is wasting a great deal of the money it appropriates, particularly in the executive departments in the city of Washington. I want to call attention to the fact that a special privilege or favoritism exists in the departments at Washington by which employees work less than the full standard day of eight hours, and by which they have an unusual and undue number of leaves of absence and holidays. When I say unusual and undue, I mean compared with the great mass of civil-service employees throughout the country, as well as the great mass of private employees. I think it will be a matter of surprise to the farmers interested in this bill, and expecting the money appropriated to be expended in the most efficient way, to learn that the clerks of Washington only work seven hours a day, or an average of 208 days out of 365. We owe it, I think, to the farmers of this country, as well as to all other taxpayers, to see that the activities of the Government are expended and attended to in every helpful way; and in order to do so, I think we are entitled also to demand a dollar's worth of work for every dollar expended. The men who are asked to pay the taxes in this country almost uniformly work a minimum of eight hours a day. In fact, a large number of men, taxpayers, are still demanding and hoping to get their working time reduced to eight hours a day.

The farmer has never been allowed to work less than eight hours a day. Conditions do not permit it. The great mass of private employees are not permitted to work only eight hours a day, those who consider themselves in a favored and specially protected class; but here we have a class who live off the taxes, who are paid off the taxes collected from these wage-workers and the producers of the Nation, who work only seven hours a day. The net result of that is a loss of \$5,000,000 of the people's money in administering the Government in Washington. Not all of it is involved in this bill. This is one of the bills providing for a part of the executive departments in Washington. But this matter must be corrected in several different bills, of which this is one, and this bill illustrates more clearly than any other the indefensible contrast between the hours of labor of the man who pays the taxes and the hours of labor of those who are paid out of the taxes. What is the net result? The net result is that we employ an undue number of clerks and employees in Washington to accomplish the Government work. We hire too many people, and as we increase the activities of the Government—and we do it in each bill—we are increasing the evil, because every time we appropriate any money for any expenditure in the city of Washington we do it upon the theory that we only get 80 cents on the dollar for every dollar of money expended in the city of Washington for labor. The farmers might just as well understand that their dollar is cut to an 80-cent dollar the minute it is put into the Agricultural bill, and if they do understand that, and want it done, that is their business, because they pay the bills; but my observation is that we do not want it done. The farmer who pays the taxes and who demands these activities from the Government to permit him to increase the production out of which he pays the taxes, will also demand and insist upon having a fair return for the Federal money expended in his behalf.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Presently. We will not be able to decide the farmer by saying that this is the result of a custom. To say that it is the result of a custom is simply to say that it is a vested wrong, because if it is a custom that does not make it right. Because it has been done in the past is no reason why we should continue it. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know if the gentleman can tell us about the percentage of Federal taxes that the farmer pays?

Mr. BORLAND. That would be very difficult. There are a great many good economists who figure out that the farmer practically supports the country. In other words, that all men who engage in other occupations—manufacturing, transportation, distribution—are a part of the pyramid of which the farmer is the base. Gentlemen will understand that we can not argue that proposition; but if the farmer only paid a very small portion of the tax, he is entitled to honesty and justice in the expenditure of that tax. I think it is easily correct to say that the farmer pays in the aggregate, directly and indirectly, 50 to 55 per cent of the taxes.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. If this amendment should be adopted just as it is proposed by the gentleman, does he not think that the people in these offices would simply be kept there for an additional length of time and that neither this bill nor any other would probably be one penny less than it is now? We would simply compel somebody to stay there a little longer than they otherwise would stay.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not think so. I have heard the argument that these clerks, even if you kept them there for eight hours, would not do any more work than they do now. I think that is a reflection upon the great mass of clerks. They are supposed to give a certain amount of labor, and I know if they are there for eight hours a day they ought to perform a larger volume of labor per unit than they do now. In other words, it would take fewer clerks to discharge the public business; and if it took fewer clerks, it would take less office space and less supplies, less rent in the District of Columbia, and everything would be upon a smaller basis. The larger number of people we employ the more office space we must have for them, and it all inures simply to the benefit of the community of Washington, where the money is expended. It is utterly opposed to the interest of the communities of the United States where the money is raised. When we come to consider that we are about to raise some more money, that we are not looking for places to expend money or to waste it, but are looking for places to raise money to run the Federal Government, we realize that some retrenchment and reform is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were—ayes 19, noes 36.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for all persons employed under the Department of Agriculture, including on the lump-sums rolls only those persons who are carried thereon at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and increased compensation at a rate of 5 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate of not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the increased compensation provided by this section shall not apply to persons whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, or whose services are needed for brief periods at intervals, or to any persons who receive a part of their salaries or wages from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I want to get some information first from the chairman, if he can give it to me. How many employees of this department will be affected by this provision?

Mr. LEVER. There will be about 12,000 employees affected by this provision.

Mr. COX. And at how much of a total cost?

Mr. LEVER. Of about \$900,000.

Mr. COX. Nearly \$1,000,000.

Mr. LEVER. Nearly a million dollars.

Mr. COX. I will have to make the point of order.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman understands it will come in under the rule?

Mr. COX. I know there is a rule, but the rule does not make this particular provision palatable.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Indiana will permit, I will say a rule was passed making this identical language in order on the bill, and it will save time not to press the point of order. I am prepared to offer it in the identical language.

Mr. COX. I would rather have the amendment offered in the same language; I do not care if it is torn out of the bill and offered. I make the point of order on it, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment as a new paragraph to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Following page 86, as a new paragraph:

"That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for all persons employed under the Department of Agriculture, including on the lump-sum rolls only those persons who are carried thereon at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and increased compensation at a rate of 5 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate of not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the increased compensation provided by this section shall not apply to persons whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, or whose services are needed for brief periods at intervals, or to any persons who receive a part of their salaries or wages from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think so important an amendment ought to be voted upon without some discussion, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, before commencing I desire to say that I recognize now the futility of opposing this amendment at this time. The Committee on Appropriations has inserted this language in the legislative bill. The Indian bill has already reached the Senate and the proposition now is to insert it there. On a point of order made by myself this language went out of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, but the proposition is to restore it in the Senate, and now, following the precedent set by the Committee on Appropriations, this amendment, contrary to the law of the land, made in order by this special rule, is presented.

I desire to say that I approve of collective bargaining. I approve of these increases granted throughout the land in our manufacturing establishments, which are realizing profits unheard of before in the history of this country. The men who labor there and who contribute their share, and more than their share, toward making these enormous profits possible are entitled to the bonuses and the increases of salaries granted to them, to which reference is so frequently made. They are receiving a part of the money they have earned, and their organizations, their methods of collective bargaining, have made this possible. These conditions are imposed, and are properly imposed, upon a business which is paying.

The principal argument used for these increases of salaries of Government employees is that in the industries throughout the land wages are being increased, and we are face to face for the first time in the history of this Nation with organizations of Government employees, and so far as I am advised no such economic condition as that has ever prevailed in any nation since the morning stars sang together. These organizations of Government employees have been arranged for what purpose? Why, for no known purpose in the world except the purpose of increasing their salaries—indulging in collective bargaining against the Treasury of the United States; 500,000 of them are dancing in wild ghost dances about the Treasury of the United States. We have had nothing like it in the history of nations since the dancing mania of the Middle Ages. They are demanding these increases in their salaries; they are demanding these bonuses from a business that is not paying the stockholders one cent. We are face to face now with additional bond issues. This Congress—and irrespective of party, all voted for this measure—has voted bonds for a merchant marine to the amount of \$50,000,000, bonds for a nitrate plant to the amount of \$20,000,000, and you will be called upon to vote bonds very soon for the purchase of the West Indies to the amount of \$25,000,000. We will also soon be called upon in all probability to vote bonds for the Alaska Railway amounting to \$21,000,000, and for maintaining the Army on the Mexican border \$16,000,000. In other words, one year from now the stockholders of this Government will have placed a mortgage on their property of \$280,000,000 in addition to the national debt already existing. That is not all. We are going to be called upon to find new revenues to the amount of \$200,000,000, and that must be done at once, and this does not include the amount which will be needed to meet the demands of the salary grab now in progress, which it is now evident will reach almost \$80,000,000, if the

Government employees have their way about it. You are probably conceding them in these supply bills nearly \$40,000,000. We are therefore about to be called upon to provide by new taxes the amount of at least \$250,000,000.

This is the condition which confronts the Nation, and at this time this collective bargaining, comprising the greatest salary grab ever known in the history of this Nation, is participated in all the way down the line. One reason given for it is that their salaries have not been increased for over half a century. This amendment provides that these increases shall apply only to the approaching fiscal year. But who ever heard of the salary of a Government employee being lowered? Whenever they are fixed, they are fixed forever. What is the argument which supports this collective bargaining against the Treasury of the United States, which you seem to approve of here by such a tremendous majority whenever the question comes up as these bills progress through the House? Why, it simply amounts to this: They can, now that they are organized, place the black hand of their disapproval upon that Member of Congress who is courageous enough to call attention to these outrageous salary increases. Unscientific? Why, of course they are. Are these men entitled to 5 and 10 per cent increase? Some of them are; most of them are not. And yet you provide this horizontal method of doing it. When this matter first came up the statement was made on the floor here by members of the Committee on Appropriations that this would mean an increase of \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000 in the annual expenses of this Government if it was carried through all the bills. It has developed now, and your attention will be called to it soon on this floor, that if this increase is carried in the Post Office bill, the next bill that comes up, it will mean an increase in that bill alone to employees affected by it of \$16,000,000. Therefore the proposition that \$25,000,000 covers it all is nonsense. It will not cover it. And even the huge amount you are giving them does not satisfy the appetites of these Government employees, as they have announced through their organizations here in Washington—here is where most of the money comes; here is where 42,000 of them live; and they all announce that they are not satisfied with the large increase you are giving them.

They propose to carry this fight on to the Senate, and they propose to insist there, not on this increase, which they say means nothing, but they propose to insist there on increases of 10 and 20 per cent, twice as much as this. And a careful analysis of their demand will show that this may mean an increase in the expenses of this Government of over \$80,000,000 every year.

The newspapers in Washington, without exception, favor this raid on the Treasury. In fact, I have never seen or read an item in a Washington newspaper advocating economy when the city of Washington was interested. The only industry they have here in Washington is the industry of running this Government, and these newspapers, every one of them, stand for all sorts of extravagance, providing it means the spending of more money here in the hotels and in the department stores and other places of business. At the present time the newspapers of Washington are engaged in a controversy as to which newspaper is entitled to the credit for this raid on the Treasury, which they expect will soon be successful. I hold here in my hand an editorial from a Washington newspaper, which I will read in part, and will insert the remainder of it in the RECORD, with the permission of the House, which I will soon request. This is the article; it appeared on the first page of yesterday's Washington Herald:

EDITORIAL.

Yesterday the Evening Star, with a brave display of a full page of cartoons, directed attention to the fact that it has been waging a "battle for the Government clerks' welfare for over a half century."

The Star is to be commended for any interest it has shown for the United States Government employees covering so long a period of time. Its endeavor, however, was but the duplication of similar efforts of at least two of the other three Washington newspapers, which fail to date back for a period "over half a century" simply because of the fact that the history of their existence is of lesser length.

For "over half a century" the newspapers of Washington have from time to time given liberally of their space to the United States Government employees and their needs.

But it remained for the Washington Herald to realize the psychology of the moment to gather around it those citizens of the District, United States Government employees, labor leaders, and all others interested in fair play, and on November 20, 1916, inaugurate in its news and editorial columns a campaign which for rapidity of results has astounded even the most ardent supporters of the movement.

Several days later the Evening Star favored the movement with a very commendable editorial and an appropriate cartoon, and there appeared on the same day a leading editorial in another Washington paper along the same line.

From the first day until the end of the campaign the Washington Herald kept at its work in its news columns, with cartoons and editorially, collecting statistics on salary raises the country over, the increased cost of living, the opinions of people of importance, in and outside the Government, etc., setting them forth clearly in the columns of the paper, until one of its contemporaries (which it is but fair to state was not the Evening Star) published some very valuable statistics,

and not until nearly a week later, or on November 30, to be exact, did the Evening Star again open its columns to the subject of the immediate need and justness of the cause.

If any newspaper is to be credited with the increases in salaries which we believe are about to be granted to the Government employees, data on file in the Washington Herald office and clippings of every article, editorial, and cartoon that has appeared recently in all of the Washington newspapers indicate that the Washington Herald has accomplished in about two months what the Evening Star has been "fighting" for for "over half a century."

But the Washington Herald has no desire to mar by any attempt at glory grabbing so worthy a cause as the endeavor to obtain for the United States Government clerks a compensation in proportion to the importance of the work they do, based upon present-day salary standards.

Again, we say the moment was psychological, and the only credit the Washington Herald takes unto itself is that it was the one paper in Washington to appreciate this fact and to utilize it by bringing to the attention of a very busy but responsive Congress of a prosperous country the fact that we are at a time when the largest employer in the United States should recognize an 1854 salary basis to be absolutely obsolete.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RAINEY. These positions can be filled, every one of them, in a week's time as well as they are filled now by competent young men and women to be selected from the various States of this Union. In the old days, in the old spoils days, when these salaries were fixed they were fixed exorbitantly high, and it was known then that they were, but the country then, under the old spoils system which prevailed, was absolutely defenseless. And to-day these salaries are higher, averaging \$1,200 per year, than is paid young men and young women in other similar vocations in private life; and that matter you do not even investigate. I hold here in my hand, and I will put some of these advertisements in the RECORD, a single column from one of these newspapers circulating among Government employees, in which there occurs eight advertisements of correspondence schools, advising young men and young women that if they take a particular course they can qualify themselves for these numerous desirable Government positions, 400,000 of them, and, more than that, in which vacancies are constantly occurring.

Business colleges were unknown in this country when these salaries were fixed so long ago. They are numerous now, and there is a business college in every town or city of any size in the United States in addition to these correspondence schools for preparing young men and women for this character of employment, keeping accounts, keeping books, and so forth. And they go out, thousands and thousands of them every year, and accept less salaries than are given Government clerks here in the city of Washington and throughout this land, and render service for, not 7 hours a day, as they do here, but 9 hours a day and 10 hours a day.

Keeping in mind the fact that these Government positions pay an average of \$100 a month, I want to read some of the enticing advertisements which appear in the paper I hold in my hand. An institution in Rochester, N. Y., advertises as follows:

Wanted young men as railway mail clerks, \$75 a month; sample examination questions free.

Another correspondence school in New York advertises as follows:

Thousands of Government jobs now obtainable, \$75 a month; list free.

Another institution advertises—

Railway mail clerks wanted, \$75 a month; sample examination questions free.

Another civil-service school advertises as follows:

Get prepared for rural carrier, fourth-class postmaster, post office, railway mail, and other Government examinations by a former United States civil-service secretary examiner. Descriptive booklet free without obligation. Write to-day.

Another advertisement reads as follows:

Railway mail, post office, and other Government positions are good. Prepared for "exams" under former Government examiner. Booklet free. Write to-day.

Another civil-service school, located here in Washington, advertises in this same paper as follows:

We prepare you and you get a position or we guarantee to refund your money. Write for book telling about Government positions with lifetime employment, short hours, sure pay, regular vacations.

I have only read a part of these advertisements and you can find them in almost any newspaper. The opportunity to obtain these Government positions attracts 180,000 people every year. There are twenty times as many applicants as there are jobs. The salaries themselves are attractive. Half holidays on Saturdays, 30 days sick leave every year at full pay, 30 days vacation every year at full pay, only seven hours a day work if you are

assigned to duty here in Washington, insurance policies free, the absolute certainty that you will be retained when advanced in years, the prospect of being retired after 25 years' service at half pay or two-thirds pay; these are the alluring features which bring every year an army of applicants for the few vacancies which occur. These are desirable positions, the most desirable positions of their class, and we are rushing blindly here into an expenditure which may exceed \$80,000,000, because these employees for the first time in the history of the United States are organized and are indulging in collective bargaining against the Treasury. There may be at some period in the future another organization in this country, comprising nearly all of those who are not Government employees; an organization which may get the impression that you ought to represent it here, and this organization may include the voters in the United States who do not have Government jobs.

Now, a record vote will be had on this question. It is in a condition for a record vote, and you gentlemen on the Republican side who are charging us with extravagance will have the opportunity to go on record. [Applause.]

Not a Member of this House knows how much these proposed salary increases will add to the annual expenses of this Government. The matter has been carefully investigated, however, by the Post Office Department with reference to the effect it will have on the expenditures of that department alone. The next supply bill to come up will be the post-office bill and it will develop during the progress of that bill through the House that the increases which will be provided for also in that bill mean, in that department of the Government alone, an increase in the expenditures of \$18,000,000 per year. Without a particle of investigation we blindly proceed granting these increases simply because you say all must be treated alike. The effect upon the Treasury of what we are doing does not seem to be considered in the least. The methods this House is adopting with reference to these increases would ruin any business enterprise in the world. Not a Member of this House would apply to his own private business the methods the great majority of you will soon approve as applied to the matter of running the Government of the United States, the greatest business in the world. You propose to be generous with money that does not belong to you. The editorial I have read from the Washington Herald indicates the influences to which Members of Congress are subjected here in the Capital City. The lack of patriotism which permeates these organizations of Government employees and the papers which so vigorously speak for them is a new and an alarming element in our national life. The number of Government employees is constantly increasing. The Government may be compelled to take over the railroads 10 years from now. If that unfortunate situation should develop, the Treasury of the United States would be absolutely at the mercy of Government employees. In fact, these organizations of Government employees almost place them now in control of the Treasury of the United States. You are voting these increases now without investigation and without knowing what the total will be in a considerable measure because you fear the effect of the organizations of Government employees which extend back into your districts. As far as this program has gone this raid upon the Treasury will mean, when it is completed, an amount equal to \$4 or \$5 per year for each head of a family in the United States. The farmers, 7,000,000 of them, upon whom you are placing this burden have an average income of less than \$600 per year. They pay taxes on their holdings. The majority of these Government clerks pay no taxes. They simply collect their salaries and their salaries average twice as much as the average income of the American farmer. The farmer earns his income assisted by his family, all of them work, not 7 hours a day but 9 and 10 hours a day and sometimes more than that. These wealth producers back in your districts are entitled to some consideration when you are providing these new tax burdens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask permission, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, I make the same request. Mr. SLOAN. And I make the same request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Mexico and the gentleman from Nebraska make the same request. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COX. A division, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANN. We are going to have a roll call.

Mr. COX. Then I withdraw that.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina moves that the committee do now rise, and that the bill be reported back to the House with the amendments, that the amendments be agreed to, and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on the agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CONN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19359) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RAINEY. I ask for a separate vote.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put that question in a minute. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. RAINEY. Yes; on the amendment increasing the salaries of the clerks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] asks a separate vote on the amendment increasing the salaries of the clerks.

Mr. BORLAND. I ask for a separate vote on the Mann amendment, the amendment relating to the investigation into food prices by the Bureau of Markets.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri demands a separate vote on the Mann amendment. The Chair supposes there are several of them.

Mr. MANN. No; only one, on page 75.

The SPEAKER. On the amendment on page 75 relating to market manipulations. The Chair will put the others in gross. The question is on agreeing to the other amendments.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first excepted amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment on page 86 of the bill, following line 26: That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for all persons employed by the Department of Agriculture—

Mr. MANN. That is not it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] demanded one about the salaries. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for all persons employed under the Department of Agriculture, including on the lump-sum rolls only those persons who are carried thereon at the close of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and increased compensation at a rate of 5 per cent per annum to such employees who receive salaries or wages from such department at a rate of not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the increased compensation provided by this section shall not apply to persons whose duties require only a portion of their time, except charwomen, or whose services are needed for brief periods at intervals, or to any persons who receive a part of their salaries or wages from any outside sources under cooperative arrangements with the Department of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment just read.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RAINEY and Mr. COX demanded a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] both demand a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 102, noes 13.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and thirty-two gentlemen are present—not a quo-

rum. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those in favor of this amendment will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 33, answered "present" 1, not voting 120, as follows:

YEAS—279.

Abercrombie	Edwards	Kelley	Rubey
Adair	Ellsworth	Kennedy, Iowa	Russell, Mo.
Adamson	Esch	Kent	Sabath
Alexander	Estopinal	Kettner	Saunders
Allen	Evans	Key, Ohio	Scott, Mich.
Anderson	Fairchild	King	Sears
Ashbrook	Farley	Kinkaid	Sells
Austin	Farr	Kitchin	Shackleford
Ayres	Fess	La Follette	Shallenberger
Barnhart	Fields	Langley	Sherley
Bennet	Fitzgerald	Lazaro	Shouse
Blackmon	Flood	Lee	Sims
Boober	Freeman	Lehlbach	Sinnott
Borland	Fuller	Lenroot	Slayden
Britt	Gallagher	Lever	Sloan
Britten	Gallivan	Littlepage	Small
Browne	Gandy	Lloyd	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Gard	London	Smith, N. Y.
Buchanan, Tex.	Gardner	Longworth	Smith, Tex.
Burke	Garland	McAndrews	Snell
Burnett	Garrett	McArthur	Snyder
Butler	Glass	McClintic	Sparkman
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	McDermott	Stafford
Byrnes, Tenn.	Good	McGillcuddy	Staggall
Caldwell	Goodwin, Ark.	McKinley	Stedman
Campbell	Gordon	McLaughlin	Steele, Iowa
Candler, Miss.	Gould	Madden	Steenerson
Cannon	Gray, N. J.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Cantrill	Green, Iowa	Mann	Stephens, Tex.
Capstick	Greene, Mass.	Mapes	Sterling
Caraway	Greene, Vt.	Martin	Stiness
Carlin	Gregg	Matthews	Stone
Carter, Mass.	Hadley	Mays	Sulloway
Chandler, N. Y.	Hamilton, Mich.	Meeker	Summers
Chilperfield	Hamlin	Miller, Del.	Sutherland
Church	Hardy	Mondell	Sweet
Clark, Fla.	Harrison, Miss.	Montague	Switzer
Cline	Harrison, Va.	Moore, Pa.	Taggart
Coady	Hastings	Morgan, Okla.	Tague
Collier	Haugen	Morin	Tavener
Connelly	Hawley	Moss	Taylor, Ark.
Conry	Hayden	Mott	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Ohio	Hayes	Mudd	Temple
Cooper, W. Va.	Helgesen	Murray	Thompson
Cooper, Wis.	Helvering	Neely	Tillman
Costello	Henry	Nelson	Tilson
Crago	Hernandez	Nicholls, S. C.	Timberlake
Cramton	Hicks	Nichols, Mich.	Tinkham
Crisp	Hilliard	Nolan	Towner
Crosser	Holland	North	Van Dyke
Curry	Hollingsworth	Oakey	Venable
Dale, Vt.	Hood	Oglesby	Vinson
Dallinger	Hopwood	Olney	Volstead
Danforth	Houston	Overmyer	Walker
Darrow	Huddleston	Padgett	Walsh
Davis, Minn.	Hughes	Page, N. C.	Wason
Davis, Tex.	Hulbert	Palge, Mass.	Watkins
Dempsey	Hull, Tenn.	Phelan	Watson, Va.
Denison	Humphrey, Wash.	Platt	Whaley
Dent	Humphreys, Miss.	Porter	Wheeler
Dill	Hutchinson	Powers	Williams, W. E.
Dillon	Igoe	Price	Williams, Ohio
Dixon	Jacoway	Raker	Wilson, Ill.
Doolittle	James	Ramseyer	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Johnson, S. Dak.	Randall	Wingo
Doughton	Johnson, Wash.	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Dowell	Kahn	Reilly	Woods, Iowa
Dunn	Keams	Ricketts	Woodyard
Dyer	Keating	Roberts, Nev.	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	Keister	Rogers	

NAYS—33.

Almon	Dickinson	Klinchloe	Rouse
Aswell	Dies	McKellar	Sherwood
Bailey	Eagle	Moon	Stephens, Miss.
Barkley	Emerson	Morgan, La.	Thomas
Bell	Garner	Oliver	Webb
Black	Gray, Ind.	Park	Young, Tex.
Burgess	Helm	Quin	
Cox	Hensley	Rainey	
Decker	Johnson, Ky.	Rayburn	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Rucker

NOT VOTING—120.

Aiken	Dale, N. Y.	Gray, Ala.	Kreider
Anthony	Davenport	Griest	Lafean
Bacharach	Dewalt	Griffin	Leshner
Barchfeld	Dooling	Guernsey	Lewis
Beakes	Driscoll	Hamill	Lieb
Beales	Drukker	Hamilton, N. Y.	Liebel
Benedict	Dupré	Hart	Lindbergh
Bowers	Eagan	Haskell	Linthicum
Bruckner	Elston	Heaton	Lobeck
Brumbaugh	Ferris	Heflin	Loft
Buchanan, Ill.	Finley	Hill	Loud
Callaway	Focht	Hinds	McCracken
Carew	Fordney	Howard	McCulloch
Carter, Okla.	Foss	Howell	McFadden
Cary	Foster	Hull, Iowa	McKenzie
Casey	Frear	Husted	McLemore
Charles	Gillett	Jones	Maher
Coleman	Glynn	Kennedy, R. I.	Miller, Minn.
Copley	Graham	Kless, Pa.	Miller, Pa.
Cullop		Konop	Mooney

Moore, Ind.	Pratt	Schall	Swift
Morrison	Ragsdale	Scott, Pa.	Talbot
Norton	Rauch	Scully	Treadway
Oldfield	Riordan	Siegel	Vare
O'Shaunessy	Roberts, Mass.	Sisson	Ward
Parker, N. J.	Rodenberg	Slemp	Watson, Pa.
Parker, N. Y.	Rowe	Smith, Idaho	Williams, T. S.
Patten	Rowland	Smith, Minn.	Wilson, Fla.
Peters	Russell, Ohio	Steele, Pa.	Winslow
Pou	Sanford	Stout	Wise

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. AIKEN with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. BEAKES with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. KONOP with Mr. BARCHFELD.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. DRUCKER.
 Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HASKELL.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. PRATT.
 Mr. BRUCKNER with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. DUPRÉ with Mr. GILLET.
 Mr. FERRIS with Mr. KESS of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. McCULLOCH.
 Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. ROWLAND.
 Mr. TALBOT with Mr. BOWERS.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. ANTHONY.
 Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois with Mr. BACHARACH.
 Mr. CASEY with Mr. CHARLES.
 Mr. CULLOP with Mr. COLEMAN.
 Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. COPLEY.
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. ELSTON.
 Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. FOCHT.
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. FORDNEY.
 Mr. FINLEY with Mr. FOSS.
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. GLYNN.
 Mr. GRAY of Alabama with Mr. GRAHAM.
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. GRIEST.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. GUERNSEY.
 Mr. HART with Mr. HEATON.
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HILL.
 Mr. LEWIS with Mr. HULL of Iowa.
 Mr. LIEB with Mr. HUSTED.
 Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. LINTHICUM with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. MORRISON with Mr. McFADDEN.
 Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. McKENZIE.
 Mr. PATTEN with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. RAUCH with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.
 Mr. SISSON with Mr. PARKER of New York.
 Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. PETERS.
 Mr. STOUT with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.
 Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. RODENBERG.
 Mr. WISE with Mr. ROWE.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. SCHALL.
 Mr. FLYNN with Mr. SIEGEL.
 Mr. JONES with Mr. SLEMP.
 Mr. LESHNER with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. LOBECK with Mr. SMITH of Minnesota.
 Mr. LOFT with Mr. TREADWAY.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. VARE.
 Mr. POU with Mr. WARD.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. WINSLOW.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors. The amendment is agreed to. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MANN: Amend, on page 75, after line 25, by inserting as a new paragraph the following:
 "To make investigation relating to the production, transportation, storage, preparation, marketing, manufacture, and distribution of agricultural food products, including the extent, manner, and methods of any manipulation of the markets or control of the visible supply of such food products, or any of them, by any individuals, groups, associations, combinations, or corporations, \$50,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BORLAND) there were 214 yeas and 14 nays.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BORLAND. I am not.

Mr. RUBEY. I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RUBEY. I am not.

The SPEAKER. Is any gentleman on the committee opposed to the bill? If not, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUBEY], a member of the committee.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to recommit to the Committee on Agriculture with instructions to strike out on page 58, lines from 11 to 18, inclusive, and report forthwith.

Mr. LEVER. On that I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUBEY moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture with the instructions to report the same back forthwith striking out the lines from 11 to 18, inclusive, on page 58, which read as follows:

"For all necessary expenses for enforcing the provisions of the act approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stats. L., pp. 847 and 848), relating to the protection of migratory game and insectivorous birds, and for cooperation with local authorities in the protection of migratory birds, and for necessary investigations connected therewith, \$50,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit with instructions.

The question was taken, and the motion was lost.

The bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BOARD OF REGENTS SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 187, providing for filling a vacancy in the Board of Regents for the Smithsonian Institution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if this is agreeable to the Board of Regents?

Mr. LLOYD. It is.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 187) providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress.

Resolved, etc., That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, caused by the resignation of Andrew D. White, of New York, be filled by the appointment of Henry White, a citizen of Maryland.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The question was taken, and the joint resolution was passed.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a conference report on the immigration bill for printing under the rule, and I will give notice that on Thursday next immediately after reading the Journal I will call it up.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. R. 10384. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 186, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversion of water from the Niagara River, and I ask unanimous consent that the House insist on its amendments and agree to the conference asked for.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate joint resolution 186, insist on the amendments of the House, and agree to the conference asked for. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. FLOOD, Mr. CLINE, and Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. The purpose of this is to give an opportunity to the Committee on Education to take up the vocational education bill and spend about two hours on it.

Mr. MANN. To be followed by the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; and then take up the rule for the Adamson resolution for the extension of the Newlands committee.

Mr. MANN. And then to be followed by the Post Office appropriation bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

By unanimous consent, Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan was given leave to withdraw papers and petitions on the files of the House, without leaving copies, in the case of Joseph Harrison, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LOBECK, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two weeks, on account of illness.

REPORT OF THE NEWLANDS COMMITTEE (H. REPT. NO. 1269).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the report from the joint subcommittee on Interstate Commerce to the Senate and House of Representatives, which was ordered printed.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, January 9, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the transfer of the Government exhibit, or such portion thereof as the President may determine is advisable, now at the Panama-California International Exposition, at San Diego, Cal., to the Mississippi Centennial Exposition, at Gulfport, Miss. (H. Doc. No. 1889); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an item for inclusion in the general deficiency bill under the title of appropriation, "Expenses of Indian commissioners," fiscal years 1914 and 1915 (H. Doc. No. 1890); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting two items for inclusion in the general deficiency bill (H. Doc. No. 1891); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Labor submitting an estimate of deficiency in the appropriation for rent, Department of Labor, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1892); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on preliminary examination of Sacramento River, Cal., from Chico Landing to Red Bluff (H. Doc. No. 1893); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

6. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of Commerce submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce for repairing and overhauling the steamer *Fish Hawk* (H. Doc. No. 1894); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending amendment of estimate submitted for contingent expenses, Independent Treasury, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1895); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1896); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that an item of \$75,000 be included in the general deficiency bill for contingent expenses, Independent Treasury, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1897); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting estimates of additional deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year 1917 (H. Doc. No. 1898); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNING: A bill (H. R. 19776) to authorize the United New Jersey Railroad & Canal Co., and such other corporation or individuals as may be associated with it, to construct a bridge across the portion of the Delaware River between the mainland of the county of Camden, State of New Jersey, and Petty Island, in said county and State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 19777) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 19778) to prohibit the importation of intoxicating liquors into the Territory of Hawaii, and to prohibit the manufacture and sale of such liquors therein; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 19779) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEWIS: A bill (H. R. 19780) to regulate interstate employment agencies; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 19781) relating to the temporary filling of vacancies occurring in the offices of register and receiver of district land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 19782) to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 19783) to equip the United States penitentiaries at Atlanta, Ga., and Leavenworth, Kans., for the manufacture of supplies for the use of the Government, for the compensation of the prisoners for their labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 19784) to prevent the holding of land out of use in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 19785) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to grant extension of time for making payments on land in Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indian Reservations in the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 334) authorizing the President to appoint delegates to attend the Tenth International Congress of the World's Purity Federation, to be held in the city of Louisville, State of Kentucky, November 8 to 14, 1917; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolution (H. Res. 435) to pay National Guardsmen, now in the Federal service, one month's extra pay; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENT: Resolution (H. Res. 436) providing for an investigation of leakage of information concerning the President's peace message; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENEDICT: A bill (H. R. 19786) granting a pension to William G. Bryce; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHANDLER of New York: A bill (H. R. 19787) granting an increase of pension to James L. T. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19788) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19789) granting an increase of pension to George A. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19790) granting a pension to Charles H. Payne; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19791) granting a pension to Carey Nation; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 19792) granting an increase of pension to Philip Richards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILLON: A bill (H. R. 19793) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Luke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOOLITTLE: A bill (H. R. 19794) granting a pension to Alice P. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 19795) granting a pension to Cornelia A. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUPRÉ: A bill (H. R. 19796) granting a pension to John R. Walder; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 19797) granting a pension to Mary L. Marik; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 19798) granting an increase of pension to Norman K. Bedell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19799) granting an increase of pension to John Routin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19800) granting an increase of pension to George Witzel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19801) granting an increase of pension to William F. Raines; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19802) granting an increase of pension to William P. Shepard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19803) granting a pension to Henry P. Redfearn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARD: A bill (H. R. 19804) granting an increase of pension to Hart Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas: A bill (H. R. 19805) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo Spurgeon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19806) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Harman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19807) granting a pension to William Vanatta; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19808) granting an increase of pension to Sidney G. Sidner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 19809) for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19810) granting a pension to Cornelius Whitby; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 19811) granting an increase of pension to Houston Halstead; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19812) granting an increase of pension to Callie Hitchcock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 19813) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Gorman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19814) granting an increase of pension to Alexander J. Souden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19815) granting an increase of pension to Israel L. Hahn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19816) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19817) granting an increase of pension to Albert T. Crow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOD: A bill (H. R. 19818) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Gaylor; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HULL of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19819) granting an increase of pension to George F. Bennett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 19820) granting an increase of pension to George Brumbaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KENT: A bill (H. R. 19821) granting an increase of pension to Alden Youngman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 19822) granting a pension to James W. Hendrickson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19823) granting a pension to Charles Diesron; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 19824) granting an increase of pension to George Langley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOFT: A bill (H. R. 19825) granting a pension to Mathias Kennedy; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19826) granting a pension to Stanley W. Lemley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19827) granting an increase of pension to Marian A. Jaques; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19828) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Higgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19829) granting an increase of pension to James N. McHenry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19830) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Manning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19831) granting an increase of pension to James E. Merrifield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOTT: A bill (H. R. 19832) granting an increase of pension to Byron M. Luther; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 19833) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 19834) granting a pension to George R. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19835) granting a pension to Hugh T. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19836) granting a pension to Charles Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19837) granting a pension to Nancy A. B. Easton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19838) granting a pension to John P. Fox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19839) granting a pension to Alsinda Johnston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19840) granting an increase of pension to John Trenter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19841) granting an increase of pension to John J. West; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19842) granting an increase of pension to George A. Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19843) granting an increase of pension to John Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19844) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hoskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19845) granting an increase of pension to James N. McHenry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19846) granting an increase of pension to James E. Merrifield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19847) granting an increase of pension to Charles Shaffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 19848) granting a pension to James M. Howard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19849) granting a pension to Raleigh J. Stanberry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19850) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROUSE: A bill (H. R. 19851) granting a pension to Andrew B. Erb; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19852) granting a pension to Charles Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19853) granting an increase of pension to James Flanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19854) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Hoskins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19855) granting an increase of pension to John Hazlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19856) granting an increase of pension to William L. Faucett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 19857) granting an increase of pension to Alexander H. Lamb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19858) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Vervalen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19859) granting a pension to Ellis B. McNeeley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19860) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Caldwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 19861) granting an increase of pension to Florelle F. Brown; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 19862) granting an increase of pension to Harry Noel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19863) granting a pension to William C. Scott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 19864) granting an increase of pension to Rufus G. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 19865) for the relief of William Mortensen; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: A bill (H. R. 19866) for the relief of Ed W. Ramage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19867) granting an increase of pension to Alfred A. Alline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19868) granting an increase of pension to Alfred H. Gardner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 19869) granting an increase of pension to William McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 19870) granting an increase of pension to Gordon H. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 19871) granting an increase of pension to P. T. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN DYKE: A bill (H. R. 19872) granting a pension to Nicholas Krey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 19873) granting an increase of pension to Hannah J. Estill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 19874) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 19875) granting a pension to William McCann; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 19876) granting an increase of pension to George W. Webber; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 19877) granting an increase of pension to Otto Schellhorn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 19878) granting an increase of pension to John Mallett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 333) for the relief of N. B. Pettibone; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petitions of Alfred Pearce, Charles Salkeld, O. G. Stutler, Ralph H. Wicks, James B. Custer, Louis Wills, Edward Jenkins, Walter Davey, Thomas P. Carey, Thomas Hardy, C. F. Bunton, August Soupart, Joseph Steele, Daniel Jordan, A. A. Miller, Francis Wortz, Charles Brosch, William Shuck, Herman Brosch, Levi Koontz, Michael Hughes, Ralph Buchanan, W. A. Jackman, Mart Voyce, William L. Dunmire, Charles E. Leis, Harry Gay, Bert Box, Harry Kable, E. J. Morgan, E. E. Paul, O. H. Jennings, Joseph Lloyd, Henry Mapstone, Robert J. Bunton, Benjamin Thomas, Alf. Jensen, Thomas Cooney, George Costello, J. C. Penrod, Willis E. Burnett, S. H. Nederlander, J. W. Roozer, William Hughes, William Lidwell, Leo McDavis, Waldo Dunmire, Fred Treveren, and C. B. Gilpatrick, all of South Fork; John M. Sloan, of Ehrenfeld; and John Reed, of Croyle Township, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for an embargo on the exportation of farm products, clothing, and other necessities of life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Memorial of Duquesne Heights Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Mount Washington Baptist Church, all of Pittsburgh, Pa., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Typographical Union, No. 7, favoring bills to increase the salaries of printers employed in the United States Post Office Service in the various cities; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Typographical Union, No. 7; the Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees; the Supreme Council of the Independent Order of Puritans; the United Presbyterian Board of Publication, the United Presbyterian, and Thomas A. Duff, of Pittsburgh, against amendment to appropriation bill to make a zone system to all magazines and periodicals now mailed as second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Pittsburgh (Pa.) Typographical Union, No. 7, against passage of bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia and against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition against House bill 18986, prohibiting the use of the United States mails to papers and magazines containing liquor advertisements; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENEDICT: Petition of A. J. Kelly and others, of California, praying for the passage of the volunteer officers' retired list of the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Board of Trade of San Francisco; Credit Men's Association of Los Angeles; and the Wholesalers' Board of Trade of Los Angeles, all in the State of California, opposing the proposed repeal of the national bankruptcy law; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Foothills Valley Federation of California, in favor of a food embargo; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Alfred Sidney Johnson, of Pasadena, Cal., in favor of an act to give full force to the migratory-bird-protection treaty; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BURKE: Petition signed by 35 citizens of Manitowoc, Wis., protesting against the passage of either of the following bills: House bill 18986, Randall mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, prohibit commerce in in-

toxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions signed by Ferd Schmutzler and 55 other business men and citizens of Watertown, Wis., protesting against the passage of either of the following bills: House bill 18986, mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, prohibiting commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of Northwestern Lithographing Co., W. F. Nackie Paper Co., Philipp-Schulz, and Wilmanns Bros. Co., all of Milwaukee, Wis., opposing Senate bill 4429 and House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Robert J. Bulkley, of Cleveland, Ohio; W. D. Boyce Co., of Chicago; Imperial Lithographing Co., of Milwaukee; and Milwaukee Typographical Union No. 23, in re second-class postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, for increase in Government salaries; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petitions of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, opposing prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Memorial of Chamber of Commerce of New York, relative to pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Interstate Electric Novelty Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., against zone bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DILLON: Memorial of National Temperance Council, favoring prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lake County Rural Letter Carriers' Association, Madison, S. Dak., relative to expending appropriation for post roads; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of sundry publishing companies of the United States against increase in postage on second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of New Jersey, opposing prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, in favor of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of New York State Federation of Labor; International Typographical Union of Indianapolis, Ind.; and the Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees, in re increase in second-class postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of La Crosse, Wis., against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 1,902 residents of the United States, favoring an embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of sundry citizens of Boston, against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of American Association of State Highway Officials, in re topographic map of the United States; to the committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of employees of the engraving division of the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, asking increase in pay; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of New York State Federation of Labor, against increase in postal rates on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, favoring increase in pay of Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GARNER: Petition of post-office employees of Beeville, Tex., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GORDON: Petition of sundry citizens of Ohio, opposing various prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 19703, granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KING: Petition of Kewanee Typographical Union, No. 164, against increase of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Locals Nos. 39 and 239, International Union of United Brewery Workmen, of Quincy, Ill., against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Fred Young and other employees of Galesburg (Ill.) post office, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition of I. Maginn & Co., San Francisco, Cal., against House bill 13568, the Stephens bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Stone and Building Laborers' Union No. 46, Washington, D. C., favoring House bill 5783, relative to changing Division of Information, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Petition of employees of post office, Rensselaer, N. Y., for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROWE: Petitions of Curtis Publishing Co., of Philadelphia; Central Federated Union of New York; the Bankers' Publishing Co., of New York; the W. D. Boyce Co., of Chicago; Bonforts' Wine & Spirit Circular, of Louisville, Ky., opposing increase in second-class postage rate; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of State of New York in re congressional inquiry into interstate transportation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William H. Cummings, of New York; Harris & Fuller, of New York; and Mailer & Clerk, of New York, in re pneumatic-tube service in New York; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SANFORD: Petitions of citizens of Albany, N. Y., against passage of prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEGEL: Memorial protesting against the curtailment of the pneumatic-mail service in New York City; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Petition of Rae S. Corliss, of Albion, Mich., favoring passage of the Smith-Hughes bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Rt. Rev. Frank A. O'Brien, of Kalamazoo, Mich., against zone bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SNELL: Memorial of George G. Hutchinson, H. C. Loyd, H. F. Plumb, R. V. McPherson, railway postal clerks, asking an immediate increase in salary of \$200 per annum for all railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of the Hotel Men and Liquor Dealers' Association, of St. Lawrence County, N. Y., protesting against the passage of Senate bill 1082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of members of the International Union of United Brewery Workmen, of Utica, N. Y., against prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, communications from the Federated Men's Class of Herkimer County, N. Y., and Tabernacle Baptist Baraca Class, of Utica, N. Y., and the Men's Class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Frankfort, N. Y., favoring various measures for prohibition now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN: Petition of sundry railway employees, for eight-hour-day law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry post-office employees, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAVENNER: Memorial of Boiler Makers, Helpers, and Iron-Ship Builders of America, Local No. 377, favoring an embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of National Temperance Council, Boston, Mass., in favor of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of James Sabin, Fritz Kramer, John Vetter, and others, protesting against House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS: Memorial of farmers and miners of Muhlenberg County, Ky., relative to high cost of living; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VARE: Memorial of United Business Men of Philadelphia, Pa., urging continuation of pneumatic-tube mail service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Worcester, Mass., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.